



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 99th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, March 21, 1986

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Friday, March 21, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

May Your blessing of peace be upon each one of us, O God, and may Your love surround any person with special need. We pray for those who look to You for healing, for strength, for assurance, and for comfort. Be with us, O God, and those we love this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 573. Joint resolution making a repayable advance to the Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1986

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LET US END NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING

(Mr. DOWNEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have just been told that tomorrow the Reagan administration will conduct a nuclear test at the Nevada test site. It will end the United States somewhat informal moratorium on nuclear tests. We have not tested since December 28 of last year in an attempt to reach some sort of understanding with the Soviet Union about testing. This will give, this U.S. test, the Soviets an excuse to end their moratorium; and it will, I am afraid, pave the way for the resumption of Soviet nuclear tests.

If this test proceeds, it will squander our best hope of containing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It will squander our best hope of stopping the Russians from upgrading their nuclear warheads to U.S. standards. And it will squander our best hope of pulling down the weapons reliability the Soviets would need for a first strike.

In the name of national security, Mr. President, please delay this test.

You have an offer from six world leaders to end nuclear weapons tests on this planet forever. Let's take them up on it. Let's do it now.

BOOST PRICES UP, THEN BOOST PRICES DOWN

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the wholesale price index has just registered its largest monthly decline since it was started almost 40 years ago. In this context we may recall the words of Stephen Leacock, the famous Canadian economist and humorist, who said in 1932:

The gold standard has fallen into opprobrium: a while ago it looked as safe as the rock of ages, and now it is being relegated to the age of rocks. We have been learning some new economic truths. Consider the regulation of the money supply. What does it mean? A lot of flowery words have grown up around this. But if that means anything at all, it means that there will be a board, a committee of people who will, as and when they like, expand money or contract money, and boost prices up or boost prices down. There will be three men in a room somewhere who will do that. If that time ever comes, I want to be one of the three, or at least a warm personal friend of all three.

Now I say in all sincerity that the three-men-in-a-room stuff will do for the Soviets; it will not do for us. You cannot have a system of social control dependent upon the will of three men in a room; you cannot have prices which can be moved up by a group in control; you cannot have wages which can be shifted down in their purchasing power by the good will of the people of the monetary caste. You must weigh that very, very carefully. The board, when it boosts prices up or down would follow, or be tempted to follow, all sorts of self-seeking ends. You cannot run society like that. If you try to have a money standard based on human interest or opinion, you have started the biggest human exploitation you can possibly imagine. (The Canadian Mining and Metallurgical Bulletin, August, 1932.)

NONSMOKERS' PROTECTION ACT OF 1986

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for too long the Federal Government and Congress have been criticized for conducting critically important business

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

behind closed doors in smoke-filled rooms.

Many significant and weighty decisions have been made behind a veil of haze so thick from cigarette and cigar smoke that participants in such meetings have been unable to see their colleagues across the table.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of those who work in or visit our Federal buildings are nonsmokers.

Yet, these nonsmokers often are forced to inhale the noxious fumes created by those who have not kicked the destructive smoking habit—a habit which damages the health of smokers and nonsmokers alike.

In an effort to improve the environment of the Federal workplace and protect tens of thousands of nonsmokers from the hazards of second-hand tobacco smoke, today I am introducing the Nonsmokers' Protection Act of 1986.

This bill would prohibit smoking in Federal buildings except for designated smoking areas that would be determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in consultation with affected employee unions.

According to the Surgeon General, no single measure would do more to improve the public health than the elimination of cigarette smoking.

Furthermore, numerous studies have shown that nonsmokers suffer many of the health problems that afflict smokers when nonsmokers are subjected regularly to the poisonous gases found in tobacco smoke.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this important bill to protect the health of all those who use Federal buildings.

Until this year, Congress has never considered seriously legislation to protect nonsmokers in Federal buildings.

But the record is much better on the State and municipal level:

Twenty-one States restrict or ban smoking during public meetings or restrict smoking to certain areas within public buildings.

Thirty-seven States and more than 400 municipalities limit or restrict smoking in public places.

Eleven States require separate seating for nonsmokers in restaurants.

Ten States have enacted laws specifically addressing smoking in the workplace.

But State and local laws do not extend to Federal facilities.

The case against cigarette smoking is overwhelming.

Smoking is the major cause of lung cancer and a significant cause of heart attacks and other cardiovascular diseases.

Smoking is recognized widely as the greatest preventable cause of premature death and disability today.

Second-hand smoke creates a serious indoor air pollution problem that

forces nonsmokers to be involuntary smokers.

The lungs, heart, and eyes of nonsmokers subjected to smoke are harmed just as if they smoked themselves.

Nonsmokers in smoking environments have no choice but to inhale the 60 known carcinogens, including carbon monoxide, ammonia, formaldehyde, and nicotine, that are found in tobacco smoke.

It is time to change the Federal Government's policies to protect the rights and health of nonsmokers.

Mr. Speaker, where there is smoke there is fire—and I intend to light a fire under my colleagues in the House and Senate to pass this long overdue bill to protect nonsmokers in the Federal work force.

THE EMERGENCY ENERGY ACT OF 1986

(Mr. ARCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, it may come as a surprise to some in this body—although it should not—that the health of our domestic oil and gas industry has been very much in question for the past several years. With the current drop in world oil prices, the industry's health is now clearly in jeopardy.

Exploration for new domestic reserves is grinding to a virtual halt. Marginally producing wells are being abandoned and permanently plugged, with the oil they could produce lost to America forever.

The result has been a rapid rise in unemployment throughout the industry and those industries which are dependent to varying degrees on oil and gas exploration and development.

We are seeing a staggering impact on banking, real estate, and all of the hundreds of service and manufacturing industries located in those regions of the country where oil and gas are significant factors in local and regional economies. Today, the problems indeed appear to be regional. In fact, however, they pose a very real threat to the national security of the United States.

Put simply, we are in danger of losing not only valuable proven domestic oil reserves, but also our ability to develop future reserves which we will need when OPEC once again cuts back production—as it did in the early 1970's—and holds an oil dependent world, and the United States, hostage.

The Emergency Energy Act of 1986, which I am introducing today with a bipartisan group of original cosponsors, addresses directly the most serious of the problems faced by the energy industry today so that the in-

dustry will be there when we need it tomorrow.

The question this Congress must ask itself is whether this vital industry, which is so critical to our national security and the economy of a large segment of America, can survive this period in a form which will allow it to do the job that will be expected of it in the future.

During the 1970's we decided, as a matter of urgent national policy, that we could not allow our Nation to be heavily dependent upon foreign sources for our energy needs. Energy independence was established as a national priority. A separate Cabinet department was created to underscore the issue's importance. A variety of legislative proposals were sped through Congress to reduce our foreign dependency. Never again would a cartel such as OPEC hold all of America hostage to its price and supply fixing. How soon we forget.

In recent months, we've seen OPEC, led by Saudi Arabia, release a flood of oil onto the world market—temporarily driving prices downward in an attempt to reestablish discipline among the member nations in controlling supply. In most respects the lower prices are a welcome sight. Unfortunately, however, the forces driving prices down are also driving domestic U.S. producers out of business.

This Congress will be shortsighted indeed if it fails to look beyond the current situation to what most certainly lies ahead once the Saudis have achieved what they set out to accomplish.

We owe it to our Nation to see that we do not lapse into a situation that is even worse than what existed just one short decade ago. We were completely unprepared for what happened in the early 1970's. We cannot afford to repeat that painful period of American history.

I urge my colleagues in the House from all regions of this country to look carefully at the following summary of the Emergency Energy Act of 1986, and the technical explanation of its tax provisions, and to join with the legislation's original cosponsors in sending a message both to the American people and to the OPEC nations that we remain committed to the principle of energy independence.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 4476, THE EMERGENCY ENERGY ACT OF 1986

1. Marginal Production Tax Credit: A tax credit, not to exceed \$5 per barrel, would be provided for each barrel of high cost domestic crude oil produced from marginal domestic wells. The amount of the credit would vary from property to property, based on a formula involving the cost of production versus the gross income from an individual property.

2. Exploratory Tax Credit: Provide a 15% tax credit for expenses incurred in exploratory activities.

3. Repeal the Windfall Profit Tax: Since, in most cases, the WPT adjusted base price exceeds the sales price of domestic oil, little tax is currently being collected. This change largely eliminates an unnecessary, costly, administrative burden on both industry and the federal government. Repeal follows the same rationale as the return-free proposal for individuals in the House-passed tax reform bill.

4. Repeal the Fuel Use Act.

5. Deregulate Natural Gas.

6. Strategic Petroleum Reserve: Complete filling the strategic petroleum reserve with domestically produced oil.

7. Property Transfer Rules: Eliminate current transfer rules which prevent independent producers from taking percentage depletion on properties transferred to them by integrated companies. Also eliminate Windfall Profit Tax rule which requires oil from properties formerly held by integrated companies, but later transferred to independents, to be taxed at a higher rate (Not necessary if the WPT is repealed).

8. Intangible Drilling Costs: Expand the definition of IDCs to include geological, geophysical, and surface casing expenses as deductible items.

9. Capitalization of IDCs: Eliminate the requirement that integrated producers capitalize 20% of IDCs.

10. Net Income Limitation: Repeal the current law 50% net income limitation for the application of the percentage depletion allowance.

11. Alternative Minimum Tax for Insolvent Oil Producers: Extend the provision to insolvent oil and gas producers which was adopted in the House-passed tax reform bill to apply to insolvent farmers. As a result, insolvent producers would not be saddled with a tax liability as a result of the consequences of foreclosure, in particular, as a result of the forgiveness of indebtedness.

12. Abandoned Wells: Sense of the Congress Resolution urging (but not requiring) state governments to impose no less than one year waiting period before requiring permanent plugging of abandoned wells—and encourage the states to permit limited plugging so that wells can be reopened at minimal cost.

13. Retaining Certain Current Law Provisions: Sense of the Congress Resolution expressing the sense of Congress that current law should be maintained in those areas of oil and gas taxation not otherwise changed by the foregoing proposals, and in the bank loan loss reserve rules contained in the House-passed tax reform bill.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE TAX PROVISIONS OF BILL

Section 1 provides the title for the legislation, the "Emergency Energy Act of 1986". Title I contains amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SECTION 101—PRODUCTION CREDIT FOR OPERATING ECONOMICALLY UNPRODUCTIVE WELLS

Section 101 provides a credit against the tax of crude oil producers that will encourage production from wells operated at an economic loss. By maximizing production from wells that are otherwise likely to be capped, it will secure part of our future energy needs from otherwise unavailable sources. The credit recognizes that it is in our national interest to assure that the most marginal of our existing reserves are not capped prematurely. The credit is determined with respect to each barrel produced and is equal to the excess of a well's operating costs allocable to the barrel over the

price for which the barrel of oil is sold. In no event can the credit exceed \$5 per barrel. In addition, special rules assure that the sales price can not be artificially reduced (either with sales between related parties or by using overstated transportation costs). For purposes of determining the qualified loss for a barrel of oil (the creditable amount) only certain production costs are taken into account, namely, lease operating expenses, severance taxes, and business overhead expenses (limited to 15 percent of the lease operating expense attributable to the barrel). The production credit will apply to production on or after date of enactment.

SECTION 102—EXPLORATION TAX CREDIT

Section 102 of the bill provides a 15 percent tax credit for certain exploration costs, recognizing that it is our national interest to reactivate our petroleum industry's efforts to expand domestic reserves for our future needs. The credit is limited to 15 percent of the costs of exploring for oil or gas in the United States. The costs taken into account are intangible drilling and development costs, geological costs, geophysical costs and surface casing costs, but only to the extent such costs are paid or incurred for the purpose of ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of an oil or gas deposit. The exploration credit will apply to qualified costs paid or incurred on or after date of enactment.

SECTION 103—PROPERTY TRANSFERS BY INSOLVENT OIL PRODUCERS

Section 103 of the bill modifies the minimum tax rules so that insolvency proceedings of oil or gas producers will not trigger federal tax liability. This rule recognizes that it is inappropriate to impose tax on capital gains of insolvent producers realized in the course of liquidating their holdings to satisfy indebtedness. Under current law, minimum tax liability is calculated, in part, based on the net capital gain exclusion. The new rule provides that an insolvent taxpayer who transfers property used in the active conduct of a trade or business of exploring for or producing crude oil is not required to treat the net capital gain on a transfer as a tax preference if the transfer was made to a creditor in cancellation of indebtedness or to a third party under a threat of foreclosure. The amount of preference cutback is limited to the amount of the taxpayer's insolvency immediately prior to the transfer. The change applies only to persons who have derived at least 50 percent of their gross income from a trade or business of exploring for or producing crude oil and it will take effect with respect to transfers occurring on or after date of enactment.

SECTION 105—INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS

Section 105 of the bill expands the definition of intangible drilling and development costs (IDCs), those costs which a taxpayer can expense when paid or incurred. Under the new rule, IDCs will include geological, geophysical and surface casing costs, paid or incurred for the purpose of ascertaining the existence, location, extent, or quality of any domestic deposit of oil or gas. This eliminates the anomaly of current law that provides the least favorable treatment for the riskiest costs associated with oil and gas production—the exploration costs—and will increase the pool of capital flowing to exploration activities.

SECTION 106—REPEAL OF PREFERENCE CUTBACK UNDER SECTION 291

Section 106 of the bill repeals Internal Revenue Code (IRC) sec. 291(b)(1)(A),

which reduces the benefits of expensing IDCs by 20 percent applicable only to integrated oil and gas producers. As a result, integrated producers will no longer be required to capitalize 20 percent of their IDCs. The change will serve to increase the parity between integrated and nonintegrated producers and, by reducing the economic risk of drilling activities, enhance the flow of capital available for domestic production.

The changes regarding IDCs will apply to expenses paid or incurred on or after date of enactment.

SECTION 109—REPEAL OF THE SPECIAL OIL AND GAS TRANSFER RULES

Section 109 of the bill repeals the "so-called" transfer rules, which currently disqualify certain properties from IRC sec. 613A treatment (percentage depletion) and IRC sec. 4991(a) treatment (stripper oil exempt from the windfall profits tax). Denying percentage depletion treatment and stripper well treatment to transferred properties tends to stagnate property holdings. The rules were originally designed to limit the cost to the federal government of percentage depletion deductions and to maximize revenues from the windfall profit tax, objectives that are currently counterproductive to the interest of encouraging continued production from marginal wells. Repealing those rules will eliminate one more barrier to the transfer of those properties to persons for whom they will be more productive investments. Failing to repeal those rules would effectively accelerate the point in time that many marginal wells will be economically unprofitable, and thus, accelerate the closure of those wells. The repeal of the transfer rules will apply to taxable years ending on or after date of enactment.

SECTION 107—OTHER CHANGES TO THE DEPLETION RULES

Section 107 of the bill would repeal the rule in IRC sec. 613(a) that limits percentage depletion for oil or gas properties to 50 percent of a taxpayer's net income from the property. The net income limitation operates to reduce the profitability of only the most marginal wells, the production from which should be encouraged rather than discouraged.

SECTION 108—MODIFICATION OF COMPUTATION OF BASIS FOR DEPLETION PURPOSES

Section 108 of the bill provides that interests in an oil or gas property received in separate transfers shall be treated as separate properties for purposes of determining the allowable depletion deductions. Thus, taxpayers will no longer be required to adjust the basis of an interest received by the negative basis in a pre-existing interest. This will eliminate an unnecessary impediment to the sale of oil or gas property interests to persons already holding an interest in the property, which in many cases, is the person most willing to maintain production from the property.

SECTION 104—MINIMUM TAX CLARIFICATION

Section 104 of the bill is intended to provide some clarity to the existing minimum tax rules. It provides an election permitting taxpayers to carry over any portion of a percentage depletion deduction to a later taxable year and indicates an intent of Congress that the Secretary will prescribe tax benefit rules to clarify that a similar result can be reached for taxable years ending prior to date of enactment (for purposes of determining a taxpayer's minimum tax liability). The modifications to the percent-

age depletion rules will be effective generally on date of enactment.

SECTION 111—WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

Section 111 of the bill repeals the "so-called" windfall profits tax, a tax originally designed in 1980 to assure that a substantial portion of the price increases attributable to the deregulation of crude oil, which would otherwise inure to the benefit of producers, has been paid to the Federal Treasury. The merit of the original policy is arguable at best; it has had the effect of denying domestic producers the profit incentives enjoyed by foreign producers. More importantly, due to the recent changes in oil prices, the original policy is no longer relevant. The tax currently generates little revenue for the Federal Treasury. It imposes a tremendous and unnecessary paperwork burden on the domestic producers and reduces their expectation for future profits from crude oil production. The repeal of the windfall profits tax will apply to production on or after date of enactment.

SECTION 110—CLARIFICATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS RULES APPLICABLE TO WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

Section 110 of the bill clarifies the limitation on the period during which the Treasury can reopen windfall profits tax returns for taxable years in which taxpayers have filed all the forms necessary to show that the windfall profits tax withheld equals or is in excess of their liability. Because of an Internal Revenue Service interpretation of a technical filing requirement, the IRS is under no duty to audit and close many past returns. The new rule, effective for return filings after February 29, 1980, does not limit the information available to Treasury as a basis to challenge windfall profits tax liability, it merely overrides IRS Revenue Ruling 85-37 and thus provides a limit on the period during which Treasury can assert additional liability. As a result, if Form 6248 has been properly filed with the IRS showing that the windfall profits tax withheld equals or exceeds a taxpayer's liability, no Form 720 is required. Thus, the statute of limitations on IRS assessments for windfall profits tax liability will begin to run concurrent with the statute of limitations on the taxpayer's income tax return.

□ 1110

CENTRAL AMERICA

(Mr. BARNES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, in a last-minute effort to get the majority of the votes in support of the Contra aid program, the administration made a commitment to an intensive negotiation effort, an intensive diplomatic initiative, to see if it is possible to achieve the results we seek in Central America without resort to further military action.

Now we have a brief window of opportunity for diplomatic initiatives to be tried because, as we all know, our body will not be voting on this issue again for some time.

I hope that the administration will demonstrate during this brief period its commitment to the suggestion that

it made that it is prepared to engage in a strong diplomatic initiative.

Just last week, the countries of Nicaragua and Costa Rica entered into a border agreement that will call for observation teams from Brazil, Argentina, Peru, and other countries. The United States should strongly put its support behind that border agreement and behind the effort to negotiate a comparable agreement between Nicaragua and Honduras and all of the other efforts of the Contadora nations. This would demonstrate in this period the sincerity of the United States' commitment to a negotiated solution and it would put us in line with the majority of countries in the hemisphere which support the Contadora process.

I hope we will see a strong commitment to that from the administration during this period before we have the next vote.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY WAGE ACT OF 1986

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, despite the recovery that is occurring in many sections of the country and sectors of the economy, the problem of youth unemployment lingers.

Overall unemployment has decreased from more than 10 percent to less than 7 percent. Youth, on the other hand, face unemployment rates of nearly 20 percent. More than 40 percent of our Nation's black youth are unemployed.

In order to provide needed jobs for youth, I am today introducing the Youth Opportunity Wage Act of 1986. This legislation creates a year-round opportunity wage for youths under 20 years of age and full-time students. By lowering the minimum wage requirement, employers, small and large, rural and urban, will have the added incentive they need to fill positions of marginal value and create jobs that would not have existed otherwise.

Under this legislation, young people would be employed at 75 percent of minimum wage for the first 180 days of employment and 90 percent of minimum wage for the second 180 days. Full-time students would be employed at not less than 75 percent of minimum wage.

The Youth Opportunity Wage Act of 1986 is designed to function with a minimum of redtape for both the business owner and the worker. In addition, the legislation strictly prohibits the substitution of youth employees for older workers and the termination of youth employees at the end of their eligibility in order to hire other youth employees and gain continual advantage of the opportunity wage rate.

I invite my colleagues to join with me in assisting businesses large and small across the country to create employment opportunities with all the accompanying benefits to American's youth.

PAT BUCHANAN MADE THE DIFFERENCE IN VOTE ON AID TO CONTRAS

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, shame on you, Pat Buchanan. It is you who caused the negative vote on the aid package to the Contras; it is you who finally made the difference in that vote yesterday.

Why? Because it is widely circulated and acknowledged by many Members of the majority who voted "no" yesterday that they did so out of revenge for what you expressed on that issue. They set aside questions of national security because they wanted to get you, Pat Buchanan. They set aside questions of the viability of Central America as a democratic center of the Western Hemisphere and voted against you, Pat Buchanan. They set aside questions of border patrols and border security of the United States and the questions of illegal aliens flooding into this country because of you, Pat Buchanan. They wanted to get back at you.

It has been acknowledged that that is the case. It has been circulated that that is the case. So what is going to happen? I think that you, Pat Buchanan, ought to turn yourself into an inarticulate wimp and not express yourself on questions that are vital to the administration and vital to the people of the United States.

From now on, do not influence what the majority does by setting yourself up as a scapegoat. Pat Buchanan. Turn yourself into a weakling.

MODERNIZING PERMITTING OF SKI AREAS IN NATIONAL FORESTS

(Mr. WIRTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to modernize the process for issuance of special use permits to ski areas that operate within our national forests. Today, millions of Americans, from across the country, spend their weekends and vacation time skiing. This is not only one of the most popular sports in the country, but it also is a sport that entire families can take part in.

Over 100 of the country's commercial ski areas, in 17 States, rely upon national forest land. Every year,

countless Americans are attracted to these resorts for a few days of skiing amidst spectacular mountain peaks and vistas that seem to stretch forever. However, the ski operators are burdened by an antiquated permit system that now also hinders their ability to raise the capital that is needed to maintain and operate these ski areas as safe and enjoyable retreats.

The bill that I am introducing today, with bipartisan support, will modernize that permitting process by providing for one rather than two separate permits, and by extending the permit term. At the same time, this legislation preserves the important role the Forest Service plays in managing and protecting the public lands.

Mr. Speaker, this is vitally important legislation, and I urge our colleagues to join me in supporting it.

NUCLEAR WINTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VISCLOSKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I was absolutely horrified to hear you tell us a few minutes ago that the administration is planning to send us down the road of more and more tests to develop more and more expensive bombs, nuclear bombs, that will never be used.

I cannot believe that our country could be doing something so utterly destructive and irrational, destructive of your hopes to balance the budget, destructive of our hopes of international peace and serenity.

Anybody who has studied the issues of international security knows that the specter of a major nuclear happening does not fall between the superpowers, as a practical matter of fact, because of the horror of the destruction that would be forthcoming, because of the essential conservatism and sanity, because of the phenomenon known as nuclear winter, which postulates that when there is a certain minimum megatonnage unleashed from a nuclear barrage by either of the superpowers, that there is so much dust and smoke and soot liberated into the atmosphere that, ultimately, it will block out the sun, first from the Northern Hemisphere, if the blast is between the two superpowers, and, ultimately 6 months or a year later in the Southern Hemisphere.

Now, what this means is that most vegetation if not all vegetation on Earth would be killed, most animals would be killed, there would be human starvation on a mass scale in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and perhaps in the developed world, too.

The Russians, whom we fear, have suffered a scorched-earth policy. They have suffered as victims of a scorched-

earth policy on the part of the Nazis. They know what it is to have towns and cities and villages obliterated. They suffered 20 million dead in World War II. We have never had a bomb dropped on our country. We had 650,000 civilian casualties in World War II as compared to the Russians 20 million.

No rational person really feels that a major nuclear war between the two superpowers is likely. What is likely if we continue developing nuclear bombs is that sooner or later one of these bombs or more of them will get into the hands of one of the more psychopathic and totally irresponsible chiefs of state who unfortunately exist on Earth. In Africa, chiefs of state like Bokassa, like Idi Amin. In the Middle East, chiefs of state like Khomeini, like Qadhafi, like Assad. And nonstate organizations, terrorist organizations through and through that we have seen, the Baader-Meinhof gang and the Japanese counterparts. The PLO, the various ultra and radical and extremist and violent-prone elements in the PLO, if you can assume that anything is moderate about the PLO. This is where there is likely to be a nuclear happening if the United States and the Soviets continue this continuous systematic, utterly and destructive and wasteful escalation of nuclear production.

How can our country continue this madness of producing more and more bombs that are more and more expensive and that are miring our country further and further in this insane circle of doubling our national deficit in the last 5 years, miring our society in the outrageous restrictions and mandates of Gramm-Rudman, how can we do this if the Russians are holding out even a glimmer of hope of nuclear stabilization and a final process of denuclearizing the world?

We could afford the risk, Mr. Speaker, of the Russians perhaps tricking us, if that is their ultimate desire, we could afford to have a 10 percent, or 15 percent, or 20 percent reduction in our nuclear lead because at the present time both the Russians and the United States have the power to bomb each other back to the stone age with a fraction of 1 percent of our nuclear capability. It is insane not to test the Russians' bona fides and good will by continuing the ban on further nuclear tests and probing and testing their willingness to negotiate a nuclear peace.

□ 1125

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in continuation of the remarks that I uttered here yesterday and appearing in the printed version of the proceedings of the House today.

The reason I do so is because it is necessary to clarify some of the statements that I made in a very general sense. It is, of course, my hope and desire that the executive branch of the Government, which means President Reagan and his administrators, will realize that the hour is late. That whether the President wishes to believe otherwise or not, his words and his actions taken thus far with respect to what he believes should be the actions or the line or course of action of the United States of America with respect to the countries to the south of the border. That he realize that whatever it is he has said which is on record cannot be disputed, and that, as is brought out in an article in today's Washington Post in the editorial section by Richard Cohen, who, for the first time alludes to the President as a demagogue.

I offer for the RECORD at this point a copy of that article in today's Washington Post.

"THE PROPAGANDIST AT HIS BEST"

(By Richard Cohen)

During Ronald Reagan's first presidential campaign, I would read about his reputed ability to polarize and find it hard to believe. These reports came from California, and while Californians obviously knew the future president best, what they said lacked credibility. Ronald Reagan, say what you will about him, seemed to be a sweetheart of a guy.

Not any more. The secret held by some Californians is now shared by the rest of us. There is a touch of the demagogue to Ronald Reagan, a willingness to brush past the truth and go straight for the gut. He can be careless with facts, sly in the way he misuses words, willing to repeat a falsehood or disputed fact until it is buffed into rhetorical fool's gold. This is the propagandist at his best. It is a president at his worst.

Nicaragua is the issue where it has all come out. Here we have Reagan on communism, which, along with lower taxes and smaller government, is one of his core issues. Of course, communism is important, and Reagan is entitled to feel strongly about it. But he is also obligated to stick to the facts, to what he knows and to command the networks and the front pages of newspapers, if he must, but to do so with dignity. Nothing cheapens the presidency as much as cheap rhetoric.

The leaders of Brazil, for instance, wonder what in the world the president was referring to when he said their "radicals" were receiving training in Nicaragua. Never mind. It made for a good story. Another good story is the accusation that Nicaragua under the Sandinistas is an anti-Semitic state. That charge has been investigated by Jewish organizations, journalists, even the State Department, and found by most to be baseless. At best, the issue is in dispute.

Reagan charges that "top Nicaraguan officials are deeply involved in drug trafficking." But earlier this year a spokesman for the Drug Enforcement Administration said

there was no evidence to substantiate that claim. Reagan characterizes the Sandinistas as beasts, abusers of human rights—thugs and druggies. Nicaragua is not exactly Switzerland, but when it comes to human rights violations and the willingness to smuggle drugs, it's the contras who are the champs of the region. Reagan says the contras themselves admit they will spread their revolution, but the magazine article he cited actually said something different.

All these allegations are beside the point anyway. If drug smuggling is the issue, we should invade Colombia tomorrow. If state-sponsored anti-Semitism is the issue, then we should have destabilized Argentina under the generals. If human rights is our concern, we ought to put the cuffs on Ferdinand Marcos immediately and, at minimum, redirect the contras to Chile. Would you care to compare Managua's human rights record with Santiago's?

Reagan does not pause to consider such matters. He'll do the analysis; what he wants from us is emotion. Which side are you on—ours or theirs? Brother Buchanan, taking Joe McCarthy's old tar brush out of retirement, draws the line, and Donald Regan, smugly satisfied, praises Buchanan for getting everyone's attention—like yelling fire in a crowded theater. This time the fire is a cancer that's heading our way. Only the contras can stop it.

But what if the contras fell—as they most likely will? What then? Will the next test of Americanism be the willingness to send more aid and then more aid? Will it matter then that some Nicaraguans—but probably not the government—desecrated a synagogue? Will Buchanan roar yet again on the pages of *The Post*, defining loyalty as the willingness to send troops? And will the president produce another picture of a Nicaraguan official taking a crate from a plane? For one crate, we aid the contras; for two we go to war. Today the contras. Mañana Managua.

What should have been a momentous foreign policy debate degenerated into a brawl about communism and loyalty—not about what happens if, after millions are spent on the contras, nothing is gained. Questions about the future got lost in passions of the present. Yesterday's vote notwithstanding, someday, we may look back from a quagmire of Nicaragua and wonder how we got bogged down. The answer will be simple. The president said history would be the judge—and then framed the issue so it was hard for us to do the same.

I have said before that the President had either, out of exaggeration or in hyperbole, had in effect ended up in deceiving the American people. Whether or not it was one of those premeditated or wholly calculated remarks makes no difference, because if the President has not realized it by now, he is the Chief of State of one of the most powerful governments on the face of the Earth today. To those who are looking at it extraneously, from outside the domestic aspects of the United States, that his words are taken in the literal sense in which he has expressed himself.

For example, with respect to what he repeatedly referred to, the Russian state as the "Empire of Evil," stating that its leaders were absolutely guilty of falsehoods; deliberate falsehoods. That they would lie and resort to any-

thing to carry out the nefarious intentions and purposes of a Communist.

He did not realize that the audience he was addressing these remarks to might have been sympathetic and that he was attuning his remarks to that particular audience. But that those remarks were being electronically reported instantaneously to every single corner of the globe, and that that included the very object of his remarks; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

After all, we are not talking about a country that is sunk in the backwardness of peasantry that it was just 50 years ago. We are talking now about a country and its leaders who now out-produce us in petroleum products; who have satisfactorily completed and are delivering gas in this vast gas pipeline from the Siberian gas fields to western Europe, and which construction the President had tried to stop by trying to invoke an embargo thinking that what we call our allies, that is, West Germany, France, and the Central European countries would join, only to find that he had to retract; he had to very quietly crawl out of that hole that he had gotten himself into.

The same thing happened with respect to the, whether he intended it or not, creation of a war psychosis among us toward Russia. He had to crawl out of the hole somehow by the time he reached the point of arriving to the summit meeting in Switzerland late last year.

All of these things we may think have been successfully PR'd, and they might have in our country. Our citizens have no alternative. But remember that these words are being printed, scrutinized and evaluated by highly intelligent people living in other countries and also those that are erstwhile allies and who do not share that feeling and that thought that the President has expressed as the national leader and spokesman for our country.

With respect to Latin America, it has been obvious that the President has miscalculated; that he has only offered a bankrupt, stale and abandoned course of action since 1929. The President has, in his dealings with Latin America, turned the clock back and evoked the "gunboat diplomacy" of Calvin Coolidge of 1929.

I feel that either as an individual or as a collective group of individuals in any nation that we must learn from experience. We know that individually it is catastrophic for an individual not to learn from experience.

What does the record show? What is the record with respect to Mr. Reagan's utterances and decisions taken with respect to the countries south of the border? They are no different than those that were taken in the case of Cuba in 1960. Absolutely no different.

In fact, it is error compounded upon error in the case of some of the Central American countries, particularly El Salvador and Nicaragua. In the case of Cuba, we know the history. We know that in April 1960 what was called the special group, the CIA, and the State Department, incidentally, created actually in 1957, and which was charged with the responsibility of special operations that were supposedly to be nonmilitary in nature.

□ 1135

We know that on April 26, 1957, this body was created. We know also that in April of 1960 the group embarked upon a program that was supposed to provide guerrilla training for company sized groups; that is, 150 to 250 men, that would make incursions into the six Cuban Provinces, the idea being that Fidel Castro, who has recently taken over the power in Cuba as of 1 year before, in 1959, was very amenable to being knocked out through guerrilla tactics, because it was very solemnly established by the CIA that Castro was vulnerable, because the Cuban Army which had been more or less neutral during the active military phase of the Castro revolution would not be of any help to Fidel Castro, that Fidel Castro in effect had not been able to muster the popular support among the Cuban people.

It was also very definitely solemnly established by the CIA and this group that if this hard core of exiles, mostly in the Florida area, could be given the help through CIA funding, that such a course could successfully be carried out, as I say, in company sized, in simultaneous incursions into the six Cuban Provinces; so that by December 1960 the CIA had expended close to \$3 million for this purpose in the Miami, FL, area alone. This did not include the simultaneous training camps and their cost, also sponsored by the CIA, in the then Somoza's Nicaragua and in other parts of Central America and one or two other countries; so that it was firmly believed and it was on the basis of this, even though to this day it is still a mystery and a puzzle, how this operation could have been approved without considering the fact that it would entail military type of action, because as I said initially, the group was formed for special purposes, special operations, and it was called a special operations group for activities involving supposedly nonmilitary action; but how anybody could fail to see that it would certainly be military to provide guerrilla training for company sized groups of the purpose of making incursion into Cuban territory is something that still puzzles the historians and the experts and those connected with the administration at the time.

The rest is history. Nothing fails like failure. If we do not know by now, that is I am speaking of we in the Congress, that President Reagan's policies or what passes for policies, which I assail as nonpolicies, but rather ad hoc spasm reactions to ad hoc situations.

No administration, even including President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, has really announced a fundamental long-range American program or policy, both economic and diplomatic, but particularly economic, with respect to this world to the south of our borders, which like the rest of the world has changed dramatically in the last decade and a half and in which and during which the American private economic sector abandoned Latin America. They went after those lucrative incursions and investments in Korea, Japan, and overseas, with the tremendous exponential increase in the multinationals, most of which were American based, and which attracted the eyes of investors because they were talking in terms of 30 and 35 percent yields; so that the real substantial stake that was building up with respect to the United States in the countries south of the border were abandoned.

So there has been no real policy formulation of a creative constructive type since Franklin Roosevelt and his promulgation of the good neighbor policy.

Now, nothing fails like failure, but also nothing succeeds like success and the success of President Roosevelt's plan was clearly proven all during the time that we found ourselves totally committed in a global struggle known as World War II.

Instead of that intense anti-American sentiment which has always existed since the prior policies and tactics, including the Mexican War, the 14 invasions that we have conducted in Nicaragua alone between the last century and this century, the various others, Santo Domingo and Haiti, where we have actually occupied these countries, has produced what—it has produced a pervasive under the surface anti-American feeling; however, the good neighbor policy resulted in a creative and therefore productive of good for American interests, because when World War II broke out, despite the very heavy presence of pro-German sentiment in the ruling establishments in Latin America, including Mexico, where the outstanding publishing figures or families and those in control of the radio networks at that time were openly pro-Nazi, were in Argentina until the last day of the war all you had to do in Buenos Aires was pick up a phone, get long distance and communicate with Berlin, because those South Atlantic cables were never, never interrupted. We were worried and did concern ourselves with North America, and we should have.

I also want to remind my colleagues that the success of the policy that was created was not the result of an easy target. President Roosevelt was bitterly assailed by the vested interests, particularly the oil and gas interests in the United States, the heavy investment sector of our country, because the President did not invade Mexico or did not use strong arm tactics to pressure the Government of Mexico to refrain from expropriating the American oil companies' properties in Mexico.

So what did we end up with? We ended up with the Foreign Minister of Mexico, Padilla, coming to the United States right at the outset of the war, even before the United States had a declaration of war in 1941, and said, "We are your allies. We are on your side."

Then when the war did break out, the Foreign Minister came to the United States. We did not go to Mexico City. He said, "Look, we want to enter into an alliance. We want an understanding and we will give you jurisdiction to draft into the military any Mexican national residing in the United States."

So as I said yesterday, who knows now that all you have to do is cross the border, go to Nueva Laredo, go to the public cemetery there and you will see graves. On Armistice Day, what we used to call Armistice Day, you would see very, very humble people going to lay flowers and wreaths on these graves. These were men who died fighting in the United States Army, but were Mexican citizens.

Also, Mexico prided itself in what they called El Esquadron docientos, Squadron No. 200. This was an air wing that the Mexican Air Force gave to the United States and fought with us, flew with our warriors in the Pacific. Some of them died, too.

This was the result of a creative policy which Franklin Roosevelt announced as a counterpolicy to the destructive and corrosive policies of direct unilateral military intervention of Calvin Coolidge and some of the prior Presidents; in fact, going back to 1914 and the invasion of Vera Cruz by the American forces because we were going to demand respect for the American flag which had been disrespectfully treated in the port and harbor of Vera Cruz.

I say that surely we must learn. We must know that even with a flawed Alliance for Progress, which was the first creative attempt on the part of President Kennedy to counterarrest the abandonment that had taken place after the Roosevelt era, even as flawed as that was, because it was unilateral, if President Kennedy were President today and he were to try to float the Alliance for Progress, it would not take in today's Latin America. It is another world; but even that at the time was considered as a magnanimous, as

an act of moral responsible leadership on the part of the United States.

Remember, I used the words "moral leadership." This is what the world most of all expects from the United States, more than it does its bombs, atomic or whatever. It really looks to this country for the moral quality of affirmative and creative human leadership.

This is what has been abandoned by this President. This is what has been abandoned by other Presidents. As a result, what do we have? We have failure.

We have invested in the smallest country in Latin America and Central America in 5 years \$4 billion, directly and indirectly, undercover, above board, and we are no closer to a resolution in that tiny country's problems than we were 5 years ago.

Does that mean that there is something flawed in our policies? Absolutely. We are insisting on a military solution, but what we fail to see is that these are several struggles, some of them more complicated than others. They are no different than some of the civil strife in the Middle East, which is far more complicated because of historical antecedents, and because you find as in the case in Indochina, what used to be known as Indochina, a civil war within a religious war, within a religious civil war.

When we simplistically try to reduce it as an East-West confrontation, we are mis-assessing the dimensions of the problem and therefore cannot possibly as long as we based our activities on that false premise or predicate find the correct solution. In order to find a happy solution to any problem, we must first ascertain the cause and the nature of the problem in its real aspects. It may not be pleasant. It may not fit in with what we think it ought to be, but I think that those of us that have had some experience over the course of years in the public arena know that we cannot expect people to be like we want them to be.

□ 1150

People are people. We must take people as is. What are the realities in Latin America? The realities are that, one, we have had an awakening of a vast mass of people who for almost 300 years have been victims of the cruelest despotisms, of the cruelest tyrannies, of the cruelest class distinctions that you can find anywhere in the world.

When we call a friendly ally a democracy, we use that term, for instance, for our great neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, but when we use that word we really must take into account what it is that word means to a people who have never had 6 hours of democracy as we take it for granted, as we define it, as we understand it. It is really relative.

Sure, Mexico is much more of a democracy in our sense of the word than some of the less happy lands south of the border, but in no way whatsoever, in fact, I would ask any American who may not fully grasp this to just go down and live for about 6 weeks or 6 months, and I mean live, and imagine having to live, and then see what the processes are that are defined as democratic processes and which, yes, in light of this tremendously complicated cultural-historical-religious development. Just the question of religion, for example.

Mexico, until 1857, had the Catholic Church as the official state church. That meant that all during that time, what is now part of the United States, but at one time was part of the Spanish colonies, and then with Mexican independence became part of the Mexican Republic, this is what the law was. For instance, in my home State of Texas, the American colonizers got their grants from the Mexican Government. In order to hold land, they had to declare that they were Mexican and that they were Catholic, because if you were not you could not own land. You could not hold legal title.

Then came the battle of the reform. When was that in Mexico? It was 20 years after Texas had gained its independence. My grandfather fought in the battle of the reform, which was reform for what? It was for separation of church and state. My grandfather was a great, great, reverent Catholic, but he did not believe that the faith needed the taxation, and forcible taxation, by the state in order to support the verities and the doctrines of the church. So he fought with Benito Juarez and Porfirio Diaz and the other leaders of that day in northern Mexico. He indeed was the northern Mexican leader of the so-called liberals for the separation of church and state, which did not come to Mexico until 20 years after the independence of Texas, and in 1847, 10 years after, the acquisition of the United States after the Mexican War of these vast realms and territories from Texas to California.

So we have to remember history. If we do not, we will continue to resort to outworn, rancid, bankrupt policies that can only pile up future complications for our coming generations. I do not think it is necessary.

I was asked the other day, when I announced that I was certainly not for the President's recommendation, and I never was from the beginning, for any kind of aid, covert or overt, for the purposes of the destabilization of the Nicaraguan regime, whatever it was. I was asked, "Well, what will you do?"

I said, "Well, all during Vietnam I was asked that. I never joined the dissidents who were doubling their fists and shouting 'Hey, hey, LBJ, how many babies have you killed today.'"

But it did not mean I was not raising questions.

I was the one who introduced the Senator Gruening resolution in the House. What was that resolution? That was in 1965 before the buildup. It was saying, "Mr. President, please withdraw unilateral intervention in Southeast Asia unless and until you can get the joinder of the United Nations," just like Mr. Truman did in Korea. I introduced that. We managed to get 72 cosponsors on that. That was 1965. I borrowed that resolution from Senator Gruening.

So finally some of the President's advisers became very upset when I began to challenge the President's constitutional right to draft an unwilling American conscript and send him, against his will, outside of the territorial United States. This was the wording of the first Peacetime Draft Act of 1940 and 1941. All I was saying was, "Hey, we have lost our perspective. We have failed to recognize that we had graduated and haven't perceived this graduation from a hot, shooting phase of warfare based on a declaration of war, constitutionally declared by Congress, into sequela wars now known and defined as Presidential wars, and we must make allowances because no country in the history of the world—Rome, at the height of its empire, never drafted a slave into the Roman army; you had to be a free-born Roman. England at the height of its empire never drafted a cockney off the streets in England and sent him to India to defend the empire. Why did not France have draftees in Indochina at the time they were fighting around Dien Bien Phu? What did the French have? The French had mercenaries, because French law prohibited sending conscripts into other than French territory.

But, no, the United States was going to keep up what should have been obvious to us in the waning hours of the hot, shooting phase of the Korean war. People forget, but I remember, that there toward the end, as we were approaching 1953, we were beginning to read little notices of groups of students blocking locomotives and railroad trains that had explosives that were supposed to be sent to Korea. They were protesting before draft boards, but it did not get the attention that the Vietnam war did because the Vietnam war was pervasive and longer than Korea.

But I want to remind my colleagues that those wars are not over with. World War II has not ended. There is no peace treaty. We have 300,000 military in Germany alone. In Korea we have 45,000. We have an armistice there, not a peace treaty, not a cessation of whatever it was we declared impelled us to intervene in the Korean Peninsula.

So we must keep in mind, because I think it is fatal not to do so. From each one of these experiences we should learn that there are limitations to power in today's world; that no matter how much we know we are in the right, we have to temper our judgment with the pragmatism of the reality of the situation.

What I am saying in the case of Central America, with particular reference to the sovereign, or supposedly sovereign nations of El Salvador and Nicaragua, is that we must recognize what it is that succeeds, as compared to that which fails. If the President is basing his request, for instance, as he did up until yesterday, for \$100 million for the Contras, was that what he really wanted? If so, then why have a provision in the same suggested legislation that the Congress give him the imprimatur of approval to provide for the first time active-duty American servicemen as military advisers to the Contras.

□ 1200

Now in international law where does that place us? We like to accuse Soviet Russia of being a great violator of international law and treaties. But what is the record?

The record is that even right now the world tribunal, the World Court has got us in what is tantamount in legal jargon of a restraining order to cease and desist the acts of war against whom? Nicaragua. Why? Because we appeared before the Court in defense of the allegations raised by the Nicaraguan Government that we were directly responsible for the mining and bombing of harbors, post facilities, public buildings, and others such as attempted assassination of their leaders. The Court heard the case. When it announced its decision, we walked out of the World Court. Now I say that that is wrong. It is obviously wrong, and the President cannot obtain the moral support of any country as he has not up to now, even in the Western Hemisphere.

Now if the President is talking about how well, let us see if we can come up with a diplomatic solution, it is actually a little late for that. The United States is not going to be trusted, particularly by a country like Nicaragua whose very name of Sandinista group or the name of the revolution and the name of Sandino should evoke a very bitter feeling toward the United States. It evokes the one man that resisted the American invasions, and around whose banner the majority of the sentiment of the Nicaraguan has been all along. It has never been stamped out.

Now whether this is right or wrong or indifferent, that is a reality. So we have thwarted any attempt, even on the part of the major nations to the

south of the border, to arrive at a peaceful settlement.

Just a month ago, Nicaragua, the one that is supposed to be a threat to the neighbors, including Costa Rica whom we have militarized now for the first time in three decades, they do not want to be militarized, but we have, we have done it, but last month, those two nations, Costa Rica and Nicaragua, after a parlay and a conference, entered into an agreement for the formation of a bilateral commission to peacefully resolve their border disputes.

Now let us look at what did succeed for the United States, this time under President Eisenhower, a Republican. I alluded to President Roosevelt because he is, history shows he was the first to build an edifice of constructive, creative approaches and the result was good. We ended up in our time of difficulty and need with allies and not enemies on our front porch.

Now President Eisenhower was President in 1957, and you have the last flareup of the border dispute which had some violence attached to it between Honduras and Nicaragua. Again, the basic nations, with the exception of one, that we call the contadora group today got together and said, Mr. United States, Mr. Uncle Sam, we want to find a peaceful solution. Will you join us? And Eisenhower did. And what happened? Did they resent us? No, they made us the leader of the group. They actually wanted the moral leadership and the approval of the United States, and they got it, and once they did, they subordinated themselves to American leadership.

They are not dumb. They know that America is a leader. They know America has the power.

What they are scared of is the use of that power on a bully basis rather than on a big brother basis, or a father basis, or a partner basis, whatever you want to call it. So that what happened in that case, the United States joined that group of nations. They went to the World Court again. Well, they called it the International Tribunal for the Settlement of Disputes, and they resolved that border dispute. It has been resolved, and it has been in peace until we went in there under Secretary of State Haig who got a handful of Argentine militaries, because that is all we started out with, we started out with Argentine soldiers and put them in Honduras with the avowed purpose of destabilizing the Sandinistas. The militaries of Argentina were considered the most bitter anti-Castro people around.

Year before last, or maybe it was less than that time, these same military were in Havana, Cuba, toasting Fidel Castro. Does that mean that Fidel Castro is a great successful diplomat? Of course not. We are the ones that have made him. Just like our policies

have ended up in solidifying, not disuniting, but solidifying the Sandinista front or the hard-core front in Nicaragua. We have given them justification. Instead of giving that moderate element that is there, we have actually aided and abetted in destroying that element.

In El Salvador, our policy has aided and abetted in the murdering and in the extinction of that moderate group that would be the only help anyway for some stabilization and some progress along what we call Democratic processes.

But let us go back. What happened with Secretary Haig's misbegotten notion that we could continue to divide and conquer processes that had been traditional in our handling of these with the exception of the Roosevelt era and even the Eisenhower era in which we ended up actually with more strengthened, moral and actual leadership and leverage for collective leadership in the new world than before. Instead of that, we have sown dragon's teeth, and it is inevitable that we will sow the harvest of bloodshed and war, an era of bad feelings. The reproduction in the new world of the ancient European rivalries and hatreds and traditional spirit of belligerency and hatred that even to this day still prevails in Europe.

I think that our leadership potential in our country is far greater than that. It has come forth in the past. I do not see it in the present, because I see very grave distortions in entering into our judgmentmaking processes.

All I am saying here as one individual, who is very conscious and aware of this heritage, both cultural, historical, it is interlacing throughout our historical development with Americas, though it has not been noted much in our conscious awareness, but that which now more than ever, where the world has contracted, where these leaders that could have been successfully isolated just 20 years ago, today in a half a day's time can travel in person across the world, and where, therefore, we have the greater responsibility of developing, and at no matter what pain, what time, what travail it takes an affirmative, a creative, short term and long term, because now what we have done here in the last 5 years is created an urgent necessity to approach on an ad hoc basis, but nevertheless we must have as a backdrop a long-term approach that will not reflect the spasmodic interruptions created by the external impact of events in other parts of the world where we have equally great stakes at risk.

What is the U.S. national interest? What is the proper role of our national leaders, diplomatic and otherwise, in assessing the limits of the reality of the extent of our national interests, both security as well as economic, which I think are inextricably linked

anyway? I say, if we have the wit and we have the will to just do what? Just reclaim our heritage, what America has really stood for all through the decades. That one last solid hope of humanity still is the one last valid hope. But we are eroding that. We are outfoxed. We have even, from such use of phrases as space war, we have allowed what we say is our enemy, though I do not understand that either for there are only two major countries in the world today that for the last 250 years or so have not been at war with each other, and that is Russia and the United States. We have been at war even with the mother country, England, with France, with Spain, with Mexico. But we have never been at war with Russia. The historical development of Russia parallels ours.

I have never been to Russia, and yet, I have never, to my knowledge, met anybody who was a so-called card-carrying Communist. I have confronted some candidates who announced their candidacy against mine as Socialist Labor Party, whatever that might mean. And we can get lost in that jargon. But nevertheless, that did not keep the FBI in 1961, the day after my election to the Congress the first time, from having a local agent in charge send a memo to J. Edgar Hoover saying State Senator HENRY B. GONZALEZ, liberal Democrat, elected to the Congress yesterday, with Communist help. It took years finally to dig out that dossier, but there it was. And then I discovered that the FBI had a dossier on me since I had been a State Senator and had addressed the State convention of the AFL-CIO alongside then U.S. Senator Ralph Yarborough. I do not know why to this day, but where in the world was this notion that I had been elected to the Congress with Communist help? There is not a soul, including my opponents in San Antonio, that would have done anything but given a big horse laugh if they had seen that, because nobody in San Antonio, including the FBI, could show the existence of a card-carrying Communist except one fellow by the name of Sanford who proclaimed to all and sundry that he Marxist-Leninist or something. Now whether he was a card-carrying member of the Communist Party, that I do not know. But if Mr. Sanford was for me, I never heard of it. I never heard from him.

Let me tell you that if the Devil with pitchfork and tail and horns had come and said well, you know, I have a registration card and I want to vote for you, do you want my vote, then I would have said you are doggone right, go on and vote for me. That does not mean that I would communicate or would have done what the Devil said I should do, but I would say if you want to be for me, go to it. But I

never have found out who this fellow Sanford is or was. All I know is what the newspaper said in San Antonio.

□ 1215

Yet this is a dossier in the FBI files, so that when we then depend on such agencies as the FBI and the CIA, not in the United States, but in external territories to tell us who the Communists are; let me tell you, we are on awfully weak ground. Very poor ground.

Because I am still in touch with a good segment of Mexican establishment leadership, and I have been called from time to time by some of these leaders saying, "What are you all going to do about these Communists in our country?"

When I say "Which ones?" They point to a local labor leader that is shouting demands for improved conditions in wages and salaries, and I say "Well, why do you say he is a Communist?" Well, because he says he is a socialist.

I said, "Well, but what about his demands. Are they justified?" Well, of course not, not to them. I do not know of any employer south of the border that thinks or ever has thought any more than the ones up here in the United States, so that there is no framework of reference except in extreme actions in these societies.

This is the reason you have revolutions; because the processes for change are so impossible of access there is no way that the society structured south of the border have been able to provide.

Mexico, I think, is one reason it has been lauded properly as having been the first country to obtain civilian governments through regular election processes, but when we look at the processes, they are not what we would define as democratic electoral processes.

You have the one institutional party. Finally, about some 15 to 20 years ago they recognized a need for some reform, so they provided for a pro rata, 10 percent or less, membership in the Halls of their Congress for elements not belonging to the pre- or the institutional revolutionary party.

In Russia, anybody will tell you—the Russians will tell you—we have elections. But when they use the word "elections" to them, sure, it's democracy. It's people. To us we would hardly say that. Why? Because there is only one party and one candidate under one party in the election.

Yes, they will choose. But it is just like we used to have the one party system in the State of Texas. All of the big issues; liberal, conservative were resolved within the general framework of the Democratic Party. We did not have a viable two party system.

Well, in these countries such as in an institutionalized and inherited au-

thoritarian-type of basis of societal structure, of course it is democratic compared to what maybe was the case under the czars; but certainly not at all anywhere near the definition we would consider of free, open election or electoral process.

Now they attack us on the—Fidel Castro makes speeches almost weekly saying, "What do you mean you have democratic elections? Why, if you do not have the money, if you don't come from the rich segment or have their approval, what are you going to get elected to in the United States?" That is their criticism.

We know differently because we know that you cannot generalize that way about this great country, but it ought to be apparent to us too that we cannot commit the same sin of over-generalization with respect to all of these countries that constitute this generic name we give—Latin America. Each and every one of them has a very separate and unique history.

I am saying that we ought to evoke the constructive and creative type of approaches. Dismiss the military.

When I am asked: Well, what would you do? Well, it was the same thing that got the Johnson advisers and the President on one occasion pretty excited. In fact, I did not get invited to ride back home on Air Force One for 90 days because I was asked point blank: "Well, what would you do?"

I said "Well, that's begging the question. I didn't order our men, and I have a bunch of constituents over there fighting and dying"—my district is the most voluntary-ist people in the whole country; the first to fall in Korea was a San Antonian, and the greatest number of Congressional Medal of Honor winners out of Texas were people that came from the particular group that I come from.

There is no question—I mean, you do not—it is a patriotic group. I would say most every American, if not every American I have known of any extraction is very patriotic. That is not the issue.

The issue is, what is our approach to a changed world in our front and back porch in view of the fact that the policy of direct intervention, unilateral, rather, whether it is indirect or direct—unilateral military on the basis that a military solution is the answer.

Obviously, it should be to us obvious that it is a failed approach. It is not clear to me at times when I hear my national leaders talk about communism whether the main idea is to purify ideologically these countries.

If so, there are great contradictions that are written about in editorials and journals throughout the world, because we get into secret military agreements with the Communist People's Republic of China and do not bat an eye.

Yet we get alarmed if some radical, loudspoken individual who happens to be a member of a revolutionary group says, "I'm a Marxist-Leninist."

We do not think of invading France, because the French cabinet has two communists right now, live and kicking. I think that if Latin America were English-speaking, or these were peoples that had an Anglo-American heritage, we would never be thinking of approaching the problem the same way that we have been up to now, at all.

I really sincerely believe that. I hope I am wrong, but the evidence indicates otherwise. What I am appealing to is reason on the basis of the historical facts; on the basis of the policies that have worked and the policies that have not and are not working now.

If it is that we are seeking to blow people out of communism, let me say that never in the history of the world has violence killed an idea. We will never be able to bomb communism out of existence; it is impossible.

The only way I know that communism and every other -ism has been conquered has been through social justice, and siding on the side of social justice. Not on the side of the despots and the oppressors, who happen to say "we hate communism." Hitler was the greatest anti-Communist ever, but we must remember that Hitler came into power under what party label? The National Socialist Party of Germany.

Mussolini came to power—the Socialist Workers. They all came up piggyback on the workers, so-called.

Russia—it is not the United Soviet Communist Republics; it is the United Soviet Socialist Republics. So obviously we must be careful how we use words, and what our basic intention is.

Do we avow the policy in recognizing that a civil war that is indigenous, native, has not been imposed by any external influence—is such even though some of the leaders mouth Marxist-Leninist dialectics? And who necessarily are not enemies of the U.S. interest, or do we all lump them in and say, "Doggone it, as long as you keep pronouncing that you are a Marxist-Leninist, we are going to try to kill you."

Well, I think that has been the biggest unlearned lesson of America since 1918, when we invaded Russia. We lost 350 soldiers in that invasion, with England and France, to try to put down the Russian revolution.

How ridiculous that was, history shows us. We have not learned even from Vietnam, in which, whether we liked it or not, we were involving ourselves in a civil war. Whether it was that we were fighting communism or not.

I ask, in the name of just plain common sense and reason, learning of the experiences that have beset us,

that we just resort to the traditional American pragmatic, practical approach.

□ 1225

I think this is a big basic difference today. I think this is what the columnist Coyne is saying though he did not say it in those words in his article in today's Post that for the first time we have an ideolog in the office of the Presidency.

Franklin Roosevelt, for instance, when he ran for office, was ideologically committed to extreme conservatism, balanced budget. But no sooner was he installed than he realized he had to be pragmatic and he was pragmatic. He accepted the facts. They were not to his liking perhaps but he did accept them.

CEASE-FIRE PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, as the search for a Central American compromise continues, I would call on the President to support a cease-fire proposal that could halt the bloodshed and foster negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, Contadora faces a major problem.

The administration refuses to talk to the Sandinistas, until they agree to talk to the Contras.

The Sandinistas refuse to talk to the Contras.

So negotiations have failed to move.

On March 13, I and 10 other Members proposed a cease-fire, based on the proposal made by six major Nicaraguan political parties.

Arturo Cruz and Alfonso Robelo, two of the three leaders of UNO, have endorsed this proposal.

They will agree to a cease-fire based on negotiations between the Sandinistas and the six parties, without direct negotiations with the Contras.

If a cease-fire is achieved, the six parties would continue negotiating.

Under their proposal, they would seek:

A lifting of the state of emergency, and the full restoration of civil, political, religious, and economic freedoms for the people of Nicaragua.

Full amnesty for the Contras.

And an all-party agreement for honest, open, and fair elections.

Mr. Speaker, by accepting this proposal, Messrs. Cruz and Robelo have offered a new hope for Contadora, and a new hope for peace.

President Reagan can demonstrate his commitment to negotiations by adopting this proposal as his own, and thereby make a major contribution to the Contadora process.

I call on President Reagan, in a bipartisan spirit, to propose a 75-day

cease-fire, based on the proposal of the six Nicaraguan political parties.

I call on the President to send a bipartisan delegation to meet with the leaders of the Latin democracies, to seek their active support for this proposal, and to solicit suggestions about how the United States can best support Contadora and respond to the problem in Nicaragua.

And I call on President Reagan to send Ambassador Habib to meet with the Latin democratic leaders, and with the six Nicaraguan political parties, to work to achieve a cease-fire and reopen direct negotiations with Nicaragua, if Nicaragua accepts internal negotiations based on the six-party proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the President can help demonstrate his commitment to negotiations by accepting this proposal.

Such an initiative would give a major boost to Contadora, and to our efforts to achieve a bipartisan policy.

It would place the United States with, not against, the leading Latin democracies. It would send a powerful message to skeptics in our country and to the world community that the United States is going the extra mile to achieve a peaceful solution, to the problems in Nicaragua.

It would also create a real possibility of achieving a cease-fire, which would be widely applauded throughout Latin America as the Easter season approaches.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to President Reagan proposing the cease-fire follows, along with the provisions of the six-party proposal which, again, provides a major opportunity for bipartisan support at home, democratic support abroad, and serious negotiations seeking to achieve human rights in Nicaragua.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 1986.

President RONALD REAGAN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to propose that you join with the internal political parties of Nicaragua, in offering the Sandinistas a cease-fire proposal that would surely win bipartisan support.

Your appointment of Ambassador Habib, coupled with a cease-fire proposal of this sort, can create a realistic possibility of halting the violence, within a framework that is consistent with American security interests, the Contadora principles, and the worthy ambitions of Nicaraguan democrats.

We would urge you to support a 75-day cease-fire. We would urge you to support the proposal offered to the Sandinistas by six Nicaraguan political parties on January 30, 1986. We urge you to immediately authorize Ambassador Habib to travel to Managua, to meet with representatives of the six political parties, to explore the possibility of achieving a cease-fire, and to evaluate the merits of resuming direct negotiations with Nicaragua.

Under the six party-proposal, the Sandinistas would agree to a cease-fire, and agree

to prompt negotiations with the parties designed to reach full agreement on a general amnesty, lifting of the state of emergency and the restoration of all civic and political rights, and the signing of an agreement between the country's political parties for the preparation and fulfillment of a new electoral process that will lead to new general elections in which all of the parties or groups that desire to participate may do so, once they have obtained legal and political recognition.

As you know, the Contadora process has become tied in a Gordian knot: the Sandinistas refuse to talk with the contras, and the Administration refuses to talk with the Sandinistas until they do. However, in the Washington Post of March 9, Arturo Cruz presented an idea that could untie the knot and provide a strong impetus for the negotiating process. He suggested that he would support a cease-fire based on the six parties' proposal, without direct negotiations between the Sandinistas and the armed opposition.

We believe that Mr. Cruz has offered a solution to the dilemma of Contadora, and our proposal is based on the formulation he suggested in the Washington Post interview, which we believe is enormously significant.

The cease fire initiative, occurring as the Holy Week approaches, should be strongly acclaimed by the internal political parties of Nicaragua, who are fighting for democracy, and the democratic communities of Latin America and the world. It would provide the ultimate test of the Sandinistas' willingness to restore full political, religious, and civic rights upon a peaceful resolution to the conflict, based on the Contadora principles and the Carabellada Message.

Should the Sandinistas fail to respond constructively to a proposal of this sort, it would then be clear to all that the failure of Contadora should be attributed to their intransigence. At that point, you would unquestionably receive greater support, at home and abroad, for tougher options.

Mr. President, the six-party proposal has been endorsed by virtually every element of the Nicaragua opposition, internal and external, armed and unarmed. The Carabellada Message, which includes strong language in support of democratic institutions, as well as regional security, has the overwhelming support of democracies in Latin America and throughout the world.

We believe that Ambassador Habib, armed with a cease-fire proposal that has such widespread support, would have a major opportunity to use his considerable diplomatic skills to pursue a peaceful solution that serves the interests of our country and the democratic nations throughout the region.

We are, respectfully,

Sincerely,

Jim Slattery, Bill Richardson, Dan Glickman, Michael Andrews, Bill Hefner, Jim Cooper, Robin Tallon, Charlie Whitley, Bart Gordon, Ron Coleman.

POSITION PARTIES SEND PEACE PROPOSAL TO FSLN

MADRID, 8 Feb (EFE).—Mario Rappaccioli, president of the Nicaraguan Conservative Party, has published a six-point document which he says was presented to the Nicaraguan Government today to solve Nicaragua's crisis.

The full text of the document, titled "Proposal to the Nicaraguan Government for a Solution to the Crisis in Our Country," is

presented here just as Rappaccioli presented it at the Seventh Congress of the Popular Alliance, the Spanish Conservative Party, which is currently underway in Madrid:

The Political parties that have signed this document, inspired by the best and most constructive patriotic spirit to achieve Nicaragua's pacification and ensure its future development based upon the Nicaraguans' authentic wishes, declare their firm and public decision to make every effort to achieve these objectives.

Also supported are the Contadora Group's efforts recently reiterated in the Caraballeda message issued on 17 January 1986, especially Section II, Clause B.

For this purpose the government is urged to join the people in attaining the following goals within the shortest time possible:

1. An agreement to immediately suspend hostilities between the government forces and the irregular forces opposed to them as a preliminary step toward a definite peace agreement and the country's demilitarization.

2. Approval of an effective general amnesty law for political crimes and related common crimes that will result in an effective reconciliation of the Nicaraguan family.

3. Abolition of the state of emergency, and full reestablishment and implementation of the Nicaraguans' rights and guarantees.

4. Signing of an agreement between the country's political parties for the preparation and fulfillment of a new electoral process that will lead to general elections in which all of the political parties or groups that desire to participate may do so, once they have obtained political and legal recognition.

5. Effective fulfillment of international commitments in favor of Nicaragua's democratization.

6. The invitation to existing continental organizations and ad hoc groups that have demonstrated an interest in peace and justice in the Central American area, as well as to international political organizations, so they can express their concurrence with implementation of the points demanded.

Signed:

Independent Liberal Party: Virgilio Godoy, president.

Social Christian Party: Francisco Taiboada.

Social Democratic Party: Luis Rivas Leiva, secretary general.

Constitutionalist Liberal Party: Rodolfo Mejía Ubilla, adjunct secretary general.

Democratic Conservative Party of Nicaragua (nonruling party): Enrique Sotelo B., national political secretary.

Nicaraguan Conservative Party: Mario Rappaccioli, national president.

FREEDOM'S FUTURE: THE FREE WORLD AND THE SOVIET EMPIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this special order and one other which will follow is on freedom's future, the free world and the Soviet empire.

I want to focus on the reality of the Soviet empire, the Soviet transnational threat to freedom and security and the necessity for a sophisticated

free-world response led by the United States.

There are three propositions to this analysis. First, the reality of the Soviet empire, the Cuban colonial army, and a transnational strategy for tyranny. Second, the need for revolution in American ideas, in American political understanding, in American policies, in American institutions to match on the side of freedom this transnational Soviet imperial threat. Third, the degree to which the Reagan administration as well as the Congress and the American people has failed to understand intellectually the scale of the Soviet transnational threat and has failed to develop a response of sufficient power.

Let me expand: First, on proposition 1 that there is a Soviet empire whose threat is real and whose transnational strategy has made obsolete our containment policies and has made ineffective and out-of-date our political, diplomatic, legal, and military doctrines and that our difficulty in recognizing and responding to this transnational reality is first intellectual and second psychological.

Second proposition, that it is possible to design a new transnational strategy of freedom to defeat the Soviet empire's transnational strategy of tyranny, that this new transnational strategy of freedom requires a revolution in ideas, in doctrine, and in institutions comparable to the 1945 to 1950 Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg cycle which defined the Soviet threat to freedom, filled the vacuum of power around the world to contain the Soviet empire, explained pro-democratic anti-communism to the American people so they accepted it, invented the Central Intelligence Agency, the Marshall plan, the Point Four Program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, created the unified Department of Defense, raised the most powerful peacetime forces in American history, began decolonizing the old Western European empires in the Third World, helped establish Israel, and helped lay the seeds of the European Common Market, developed a democratic Japan and West Germany, used American covert aid to defeat communism peaceably in Italy and in France and used American overt aid to help defeat communism militarily in Greece and the Philippines, helped integrate our World War II enemies into a pro-freedom, anti-Soviet alliance and recognized that there really were Soviet spies, that some people really were security risks, and that we really did have to protect ourselves from enemies within as well as without.

These enormous achievements, the achievements of the Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg team were immense and the conflict within American society was as vivid and emotional as one

would expect for a change of that scale.

The saga of the Harry Truman-Hubert Humphrey-Ronald Reagan Democrats, as Reagan then was a Democrat, in recognizing and identifying leftwing radical elements in their own party, in labor unions, and in American life, and in fighting them overtly through arguments, through free democratic methods is a saga which the modern leftwing news media and academics seek to ignore. Yet it was a saga which helped save freedom in the Western World.

This proposition's corollary is that a response to transnational tyranny large enough to be successful will be as big, as complex, and as controversial as the rise of the containment in the Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg effort.

My second special order will outline a proposed transnational strategy for freedom and the institutional and doctrinal changes it will require. The central difficulties in proposition two are essentially intellectual, managerial, and political. That is, once we accept the reality in proposition 1 of the Soviet empire, the Communist Cuban colonial army, and a transnational strategy for tyranny, our problems in dealing with that, in responding to it are essentially problems of intellect, problems of management, and problems of policies.

Proposition 3, measured against the scale and momentum of the Soviet empire's challenge the Reagan administration has failed, is failing, and without a dramatic fundamental change in strategy will continue to fail.

Let me be clear: I have the greatest respect for President Reagan. I think he personally understands the threat of communism. He personally understands the history of Lenin's adaptation of czarist secret police oppression to the new purposes of a Soviet governing dictatorship.

President Reagan personally knows there is a Soviet empire and it is a global transnational threat to America and to freedom. President Reagan personally appreciates the threat to Israel in a more powerful Soviet empire, the threat to civilization in a more powerful Soviet-encouraged network of terrorism, the threat to African freedom in the Soviet use of the Cuban colonial army to impose Communist dictatorships, the threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere through the Soviet empire's Cuban and Nicaraguan colonies, and finally that the long-term persistence, the massive dedication of resources, and the serious professionalism of the Soviet empire combined with its development of a transnational strategy makes it a mortal threat to the survival of America.

President Reagan knows all this. He ranks with Presidents Truman, Eisen-

hower, Kennedy, and Nixon in trying to focus attention on the Soviet empire and in trying to protect freedom. Yet President Reagan is clearly failing.

Whatever tactical successes he is winning in El Salvador, in Grenada, or in rebuilding our defenses, are successes built on the quicksand of his personal popularity. As he himself said last Sunday, he has less than 3 years left to serve. Yet there are not the institutional frameworks, the political movements, the massive public education that are the necessary permanent base for a true American response to the rising Soviet imperial challenge in the form of a transnational strategy of tyranny using Cuban colonial forces.

The fact is that George Will, Charles Krauthammer, Irving Kristol, and Jeane Kirkpatrick are right in pointing out the enormous gap between President Reagan's strong rhetoric, which is adequate, and his administration's weak policies, which are inadequate and will ultimately fail.

Sincere, decent, committed anti-Communist Members of the House and Senate who question \$100 million in aid to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters and ask in vain for a strategy are fundamentally right. The Reagan administration has a huge gap between its President's correct visionary warnings of the transnational Soviet empire and the rest of the executive branch's incorrect, ineffective fumbblings and inadequacies.

The burden of this failure frankly must be placed first on President Reagan; he is the President.

In addition, to making good speeches it is his job to ensure that others design good policies, that they implement them effectively, and that they reshape existing institutions and invent new ones as necessary. He is more than just the greatest communicator of our time, he is the President and therefore the head of the executive branch as well as the head of his political party.

Second, the burden must be on his White House staff, which has systematically failed again and again for 5 years now to understand that the real problems of developing a transnational strategy for freedom of confronting the Soviet empire and the Cuban colonial army are problems much more fundamental than a Reagan speech, much more difficult than a Pat Buchanan editorial, much more difficult than once again using the CIA to ineffectively manage to do the best it can when the best it can is simply not good enough. I say this not as in any way a comment on any personality but on an institutional crisis of the first order about American Government and the American Government's inability as an institution to meet the challenge of the Soviet empire.

Third, the failure must be borne by the senior executives in the Cabinet, the Department of State, Defense, and the Central Intelligence Agency; not as individuals, not because they do not mean well, I believe they do, not because they are not serious, I think they are, not because they do not work hard, they work terribly hard; it is reasonable for these three fine gentlemen to wonder what it is that is being asked of them. But the answer is simple: They are the heads of great institutions. Those institutions currently do not have an understanding of the transnational Soviet empire, do not even use the language that describes that empire, have no strategies to defeat the empire in countries the President has identified.

The gap between Ronald Reagan's United Nations speech in which he courageously called for support for freedom fighters in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Angola, and Nicaragua, the gap between that speech and the reality of our pathetically incompetent efforts is a gap that should be a scandal if only we took it seriously.

Fourth, the burden be borne by House and Senate Republicans who agree with President Reagan's vision and have not fought hard enough to force the changes in the executive branch. We can hardly expect our friends on the left who do not agree with this policy or our friends on the right who do not agree with this policy or our friends who are pressured because as Democrats they believe Reagan is right, they exist in a caucus whose majority clearly does not believe Reagan is right, to lead the way in forcing the executive branch to become competent or to lead the way in articulating the case to the American people.

□ 1240

The burden must be borne by House and Senate Republicans who agree with the President's vision, who are afraid of the transnational Soviet empire, who understand the Communist Cuban colonial army, and who understand that what we are doing today simply is not good enough.

Fifth, the burden of responsibility must be borne by our own political supporters who have not held our feet to the fire and who have not focused on results rather than intentions.

It is all too easy in this complex national capital to be so exhausted by daily crisis that we forget that good intentions are not good results, that meaning to do well is not the same as doing well, that thinking that doing today's speech is somehow achieving tomorrow's success. It is not necessarily true.

Our supporters across this Nation, the people who were aroused by GOLDWATER in the sixties, the people who, for generations, have believed in

Reagan, the people who understand the terrible threat of the Soviet empire, those supporters should be tougher, firmer, harder on us, in insisting that we do a better job, that the measure is whether or not we are capable of defeating the Soviet empire in Angola, not whether we mean well for Savimbi. The challenge should be whether or not we can achieve a democratic pro-Western Government in Nicaragua, not whether we like the Contras.

The challenge should be whether or not we help the Afghans regain their country, whether we wish them well as they are butchered by the Soviet Army.

Sixth, the burden must be borne by the intellectual and cultural community in America, which has been unwilling to deal honestly with the Soviet empire.

It said a great deal about the American cultural intellectual community that the "Killing Fields" is a movie about Cambodia in which, according to one critic, the word "Communist" was never used. It was not easy to write an emotional, powerful screen play, to film a powerful movie about the Communist genocide of one-third of the population of Cambodia and manage to avoid the word "Communist."

Yet it is essential to understand why the "Killing Fields" had rave reviews from leftwing intellectuals, while "Rambo" was laughed at. The "Rambo" was overtly anti-Communist, while the "Killing Fields" managed to somehow pin the blame on America for what was clearly a Communist genocidal action in Cambodia.

The American intellectual and cultural communities are all too blind to the threat of communism, are all too willing, just as their predecessors were in the twenties and thirties, to apologize and excuse Communist atrocities, to somehow never quite understand or deal directly with the threat of the Soviet empire.

Just as H.G. Wells was taken in by Stalin, all too many American intellectuals and American academics are taken in by Gorbachev. Just as intellectuals in the twenties and thirties always found one more reason to apologize for the Soviet police state, so today all too many intellectuals and all too many academics find one more excuse to apologize for Castro's police state, for Nicaraguan Communist atrocities or for the Soviet empire's atrocities in Afghanistan.

Seventh, and finally, the responsibility must be borne by a news media which is critical if a dictatorship is pro-American, but tends to ignore a dictatorship which is anti-American, which uses Soviet language to explain Soviet behavior, which pretends that Jaruzelski is an independent leader of

Poland, when clearly Jaruzelski is the dictator imposed by the Soviet army, which ignores if possible the 35,000 pounds of Communist documents captured in Grenada when we liberated that island, and which ignores when it can the real nature of Ortega's Communist dictatorship.

All too often the news media itself is grotesquely uncritical and grotesquely willing to use Soviet language to explain Soviet behavior. Possibly it reached its epitome when ABC News put on a paid Soviet propagandist following the President of the United States.

The American news media stands, I believe, guilty all too often of failing to learn the lessons of 40 years of competition between freedom and the Soviet empire.

In the context of all of this, if the Reagan administration is to succeed, it will have to launch a fundamentally new effort of enormous proportions aimed, I think, at five steps: First, to establish right language; second, to establish right policies; third, to establish right institutions and strategies; fourth, to establish right public understanding; and fifth, to establish the right legislation. And I believe the steps come in that order.

If the State Department has no real knowledge of Leninism, it can hardly understand the Soviet empire. If as recently as last Friday, the Central Intelligence Agency was not aware that in its own files it had records about a Cuban general who had served in Syria against Israel and who then went to serve in Angola against the freedom fighters, and was now being assigned to Nicaragua—not, mind you, that the CIA did not know who he was and what he was doing—but it had not occurred to the Central Intelligence Agency that the fact that the Cubans had served against Israel was of rather considerable importance in explaining both the Soviet empire and in explaining to our friends who believe and are concerned deeply about Israel why the Soviet empire and its Communist Cuban colonial army is a threat for the very survival of Israel.

If the State Department, the Defense Department and the Central Intelligence Agency cannot think of using right language, then as George Orwell put it in his *Essay on Politics and the English Language*, it is impossible to think clearly about it. The failure of right words leads to failure of right policy.

Yet, I can say flatly on this floor, after 4 years of arguing and talking with three different National Security Advisers, after talking with the Secretary of State, of talking with the Assistant Secretary for Latin America, of talking with the Presidential speechwriters, that after 4 long years, it is virtually impossible to get the word "Sandinista," which is a propaganda

word stolen by the Communists in Nicaragua to deliberately mislead nationalists, it is virtually impossible to get that word out of the current government language. So last Sunday night, Ronald Reagan, who understands better than anyone that he is dealing with a Communist dictatorship, used the word "Sandinista" 15 times.

Now, if the most anti-Communist articulator in this administration uses a Communist propaganda term, it should not surprise him that the bureaucracies of defense and diplomacy use old language and fail to think clearly. If the President of the United States cannot discipline himself to use the correct language, he can hardly expect those who understand less than he does to understand what is at stake.

Yet Sandino was a nationalist. He was repudiated by the Communist Party of Mexico in 1934 because he stood for Nicaragua and against the Soviet empire.

The true Sandinistas are precisely the freedom fighters who are nationalists who were in the countryside who were fighting against the Communist dictatorship.

So, first, before this administration can do anything else, it has to use the correct language, or else it has no hope of either articulating for the American people, for our allies or for our bureaucracies what it is we intend to do.

Second, we have to develop right policies. Right policies, I think, have to be fundamental. If you do not have right policies, you can hardly expect to develop the right solution. After all, policy is to solution what a cookbook recipe is to dinner. With a bad recipe you get a bad dinner; with a bad policy you are bad to get a bad solution.

The best case is Afghanistan. If one were to examine seriously the West's efforts to help the Afghan freedom fighters, the freedom fighters who are the most universally supported on this planet, the freedom fighters who have the best case for their activities, the freedom fighters who are most courageously standing up against the direct overt Soviet invasion of their country, if we were to look seriously at the West's efforts to help those freedom fighters, we cannot help but cry at the impotence, the incompetence and the effectiveness of the West.

Where is the Sony hand-held anti-helicopter missile that is cheap, user friendly and can be trained so that anyone can use it while carrying it in a backpack? Where are the inexpensive radios that are easy to use that allow light infantry, which is all the guerrillas are, to communicate and stay out of the reach of the Soviets? Where is the light hand-carried radar that allows them to know when the helicopters are coming to set up the anti-helicopter missiles to knock down the

major Soviet advantage? Where are all the kinds of high-tech equipment which could be there if we had taken seriously in 1980 the job of inventing the computerized, light, high technology, the inexpensive user-friendly systems that would have driven the Soviet Army out of Afghanistan or made its stay there a thousand times more expensive? Where is the free world training academy to take young Afghan leaders and train them in light infantry tactics and train them in the habits and doctrine of the Soviet Army?

Oh, we have people in camps in Pakistan, we have irregulars, we have advisers; but the simple fact is that our response, just as in the Spanish Civil War in the thirties and the democracies were ineffective, our response in Afghanistan has been pitiful, and we should all be ashamed.

But then our policy has never been to be militarily good enough with regular light infantry that we could defeat the Soviet Army or drive up the cost dramatically.

Where is the diplomatic strategy, the public diplomacy, that knits together throughout the Islamic world a league for the protection of Islam freedom against the Soviet empire? Where are the public policy efforts that should be ongoing every day that focus people across the world on the fact that even as we speak, there are Soviet troops butchering Afghan. Even as we rest this evening, there will be Soviet helicopters butchering Afghans. Even as we have a nice weekend, there will be Soviet columns butchering Afghans.

We have simply been incompetent in Afghanistan, in Angola, in Ethiopia, in Cambodia and Nicaragua and we must confess it.

Third, we lack the right institutions and the right strategies. There is no institution in America today charged with developing irregular light infantry weapons. There is no institution in America today charged with designing the tactics and the strategy and the doctrine that will defeat Soviet forces or Communist Cuban colonial forces in the field. We do not have those institutions, we have not invented them, and without those institutions, we can hardly invent the strategies that will make them successful.

Fourth, how can you possibly have right public understanding of what we are doing if you do not have the right language, you do not have the right policies, if you don't have the right institutions and strategies?

When people listen to the President's strong language and look at the pitiful request for \$100 million, can they be surprised that there is no sense of, "Oh, yes, this is urgent"? "This is like Franklin Roosevelt in World War II"?

When we look at our strong language about Afghanistan and our totally ineffective response, can we be surprised that there is no public understanding?

When we look at how little film comes out of Communist tyrannies, can we be surprised? Every night on American television, every night on European television, every night on Latin American television there should be footage of the barbarism of the Soviet empire, and we should pay higher prices to those courageous enough to go into the Soviet empire to get that footage, and it should become commonplace to develop documentaries and films about just how horrible the Soviet empire is.

Yet, American television does not do it. American commercial television does not do it. The U.S. Information Service does not do it. And then we wonder why our allies and ourselves are so ignorant of the truth about the Soviet empire and the Cuban Communist colonial forces.

Finally, only within the framework of right language, right policies, right institutions and strategies, right public understanding, can we expect to get right legislation.

For 6 long years now, the Reagan administration, day in and day out, has followed a fundamentally flawed strategy of dealing with the Congress, largely because the senior leadership of the Reagan administration remembered the Rayburn years. It has dealt tactically behind closed doors with people who either cannot deliver votes or will not deliver votes.

The fact is that the U.S. Congress is shifting from a Rayburn model, closed door, handful of leaders model to a grassroots Congress led by the Nation at large; whereas in Rayburn's day, a dozen men meeting in what they called the board of education, could make major decisions. Today it is millions of Americans across this country writing, telephoning, wiring, and visiting their Congressman to help make decisions. This is a much healthier body now that it has television, now that it is open, now that the citizens can participate by mail, by jet airplane, by telephone and by town hall meetings.

Yet there has been no adequate Reagan administration vision in strategy to develop the grassroots Congress. In the long run, we have to have long throughout, deliberate strategies in operation, focusing on educating the country at large, rather than focusing on just this Congress.

This morning at a press conference, we had an illustration of the gap between what I am describing and what this city is used to. One reporter asked me, "How could you want a more aggressive administration than Pat Buchanan's article in the Post the other week?" Yet, her question was exactly

my point. With a long-term well-thought-out strategy, this administration would have had 30 to 50 people outside the administration writing that article. There would have been people across America writing that article. It would not have been tactical work to be done by the Director of Communications.

Because there is no strategy for the grassroots, there can be no effective strategy for the Congress. Congresses should follow the will of the people. If the administration cannot educate the Nation into understanding why it needs over time to develop a transnational strategy for freedom to counter the transnational strategy for tyranny of the Soviet empire and its Communist Cuban colonial forces, it should hardly expect the Congress month in and month out to be able to do that.

This is not to say that Congress should be cowardly or that Congress should have no role. It is simply to say flatly that if the Central Intelligence Agency will not declassify documents, if the State Department will not use the right language, if the Defense Department will not develop the right doctrines, if the White House will not develop the right legislative strategies, it can hardly then turn in a crunch and complain because Representatives and Senators cannot quite figure out how to do all that which the executive branch has failed to do.

As I said, I want to in these orders outline three propositions. First, the reality of the Soviet empire, the Cuban colonial Communist army and the transnational strategy of tyranny.

□ 1250

Second, the need for a free world strategy of a transnational campaign for freedom to match and then defeat the transnational campaign for tyranny.

And, third, the specific steps necessary for the Reagan administration to communicate the first and implement the second.

To understand the intellectual principles of strategic thinking and why we have been losing the struggle with the Soviet empire, the Communist Cuban colonial army and their transnational strategy of tyranny, it is necessary to focus for a moment on the basic system of thinking of our conflict.

I would suggest that the first place we lose is intellectually in the issue of thinking about the art of survival.

Sun T'zu, in "The Art of War," written 500 years before Christ, said, "Know the enemy and you have won half the battle; know yourself and the battle is yours."

He said that the process of survival is vital to the state and should be the first duty of study of every statesman.

The key to survival and thinking about survival is recognizing that com-

petition occurs at four levels, and they are a hierarchy; that the top level is vision, the second level is strategy, the third level is operations or projects, and the bottom level is tactics. And they are a hierarchy in the sense that vision dominates everything else. Strategy, how you are going to implement your vision, dominates the other two, operations or projects. What are the definable tasks you can assign will dominate tactics, and tactics is at the base.

This is particularly important because in this country we think almost always at the tactical level. We ask about Nicaragua, not the Soviet empire; we ask about General Lopez only in Nicaragua, not about General Lopez in Syria fighting the Israelis, in the Soviet Union being trained, or in Angola dominating the freedom fighters to form another Soviet colony.

Let me give you an example of what I mean by hierarchy and use a common, everyday nonmilitary example. If you have the vision that you are going to cook a Thanksgiving dinner, you have a very different vision than if you have a vision that you are going to fix a picnic in July. That vision changes what kind of strategy you will have, in terms of what you will buy at the grocery store, how long it will take to fix it, whether or not you need to use the stove, how many people you are going to invite over, a whole range of issues, even what kind of silverware you may use.

If you think you are going to fix a Thanksgiving dinner but in fact you adopt the strategy of a picnic lunch, so you buy watermelon, you buy sliced ham, you buy lots of potato chips, you may confuse all of your friends who show up for what they thought was a Thanksgiving dinner.

On the other hand, if you think that you are going to go out on a picnic or your strategy is to set the table with the family's best China and best silver, you may confuse those who show up in their shorts and their bathing suits prepared to go to the local park.

Therefore, the strategy, operations, and tactics have to fit the vision. This is particularly important, because historically we need to study the vision, the strategy, operations and tactical framework of events to understand what is happening.

For example, the German Wehrmacht, the German Army in World War II, was brilliant at operations and tactics, probably the best army in World War II. But at the vision and strategy level, Germany lost the war. And because vision and strategy dominate operations and tactics, in the end the German Army was defeated even though it was a better operational army than any of its competitors.

The British Army in the American Revolution was clearly the superior

operational and tactical army. George Washington could never have built an American Revolutionary Army capable of defeating the British Army. In fact, it is the arrival of French regulars that made it possible, finally, for the British to be trapped at Yorktown. The British lost one army at Saratoga because of a massive strategical mistake, not because on any single day the Americans could tactically defeat General Burgoyne at Saratoga but because strategically the British Army at Saratoga had gotten too far out of touch with the rest of the army and, therefore, was defeated by the strategic mistakes, not by its operational or tactical skills. Yet clearly the British lost the war, they lost the war because at the vision-and-strategy level, the American Revolutionary Army was superior to the British Army.

Similarly, the table was turned on us in Vietnam. While the American Army in Vietnam was clearly operationally and tactically superior to the Communist North Vietnamese Army, we never had a vision or strategy of that war which would have enabled us to win it; so although we defeated the North Vietnamese Army every single time we met them in battle, in the end we did not succeed. Indeed, in Harry Summers' brilliant study of the Vietnam war, he begins his book with a personal story as an Army colonel of having gone to Hanoi at the end of the war, and he said to a North Vietnamese officer, "You never defeated us on the battlefield." And the North Vietnamese officer said to him, "That is irrelevant." And in that one quote, I thought Summers caught the central lesson of vision, strategy, operations, and tactics.

If you have the most brilliant tactic in the world but your opponent can defeat you operationally, you will lose. If you have the greatest operational and tactical skills in the world but your opponent beats you at the vision and strategy level, you will lose.

It is precisely at the vision and strategy levels that the Soviet empire today is superior to the free world in our concept of the competition we are engaged in.

In the late 1940's Harry Truman, George Marshall, Arthur Vandenberg, and others invented the containment strategy to contain Joseph Stalin and the Soviet empire. It was for its time a brilliant vision-and-strategy response. It required tremendous arguments in America, impassioned pleas by Republicans and Democrats alike, fierce fights over the future of this country, the definition of communism, the nature of spying, the threat to survival.

In the end, it created an answer which lasted I believe for about 20 years.

In the mid-1960's, the Soviet empire began to develop a new transnational

strategy. Contained at the top by nuclear weapons, contained in Europe by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Soviet empire began to hunt for new battlefields, for a new way of dealing at the vision-and-strategy level with Western freedom.

Beginning with what Khrushchev called wars of national liberation; that is, deliberately establish Communist efforts to train guerrillas, magnified in the 1970's by a deliberate networking of terrorist groups, many of them trained and supplied by the Soviet empire, the Soviets developed a new approach, a new threat.

With the death of John F. Kennedy, the Democratic Party lost its greatest articulator of the threat of communism. Throughout the 1960's and early 1970's, compounded by the chaos of Watergate, the American Nation lost its way, the free world failed to analyze what was happening, and a new, powerful Soviet transnational strategy emerged. It is the Soviets who have invented this transnational strategy while we cling to the 19th-century European models of sovereignty, clear-cut choices of war and peace, recognition or nonrecognition. It is the Soviets who have studied our system. They have invented disinformation systems of massive scale and remarkable sophistication. We have no defensive measures to protect us from \$300,000 a year Washington law firms who take Communist money to repeat Communist lies to help Communist foreign policy.

We have no techniques to explain and deal with domestic front groups guided by Communist foreign governments. We are faced with a disinformation campaign of enormous sophistication, of great power, which the Grenada documents indicate clearly has impact on the U.S. Congress, on our own staffs, on the national news media and on our intellectual community.

It is the Soviets who have created a Communist Cuban colonial army of enormous power. Remember, Cuba is dangerous for many reasons. Cuba is dangerous as a Communist colony because it makes Castro a great puppet figurehead presumably independent of the Soviets, while his very survival depends every day on the Soviet empire's money, the Soviet empire's secret police, the Soviet empire's permission; yet Castro can posture as though he were independent.

The Soviet transnational system in Cuba gives them their largest spy base outside the Soviet empire. At Lourdes in Cuba they have more electronic equipment to spy on the United States than anywhere else outside of the Soviet Union. The Soviet colonial occupation of Cuba gives them 11 airfields, a set of aircraft carriers that are permanent and stationed in Cuba itself. The Soviet use of Cuba as a

colony gives them additional trainers in the Cuban Communist secret police who work closely, as Claire Sterling and others have proven, with the terrorist networks of the Palestine Liberation Organization and with Qadhafi in Libya.

□ 1305

The Grenada documents document clearly and systematically for anyone willing to read them the degree to which the Grenadian Communists and the Cuban Communists were intimately tied to terrorists in Libya and elsewhere.

The Cuban colonial system the Soviets have established in their transnational method gives them a great training ground, for example, for the Nicaraguan Communists, most of whose leaders were training in Havana, most of whom met with Castro, most of whom who had worked with the Libyan terrorists, and most of whom who have a direct relationship in our allies to the Soviet empire's most anti-Israeli and anti-American activities.

Finally, it is the Soviet transnational system creating a Communist Cuban colonial army which has given them remarkable assets. Thirty-five thousand Cuban soliders occupying Angola in what is now a Cuban Communist, Soviet Communist imperial colony replacing the Portuguese colony. Thousands of Cuban soldiers occupying Ethiopia in what is now in effect a Soviet colony. Thousands of Cuban soldiers now in Nicaragua in what is a Communist Cuban colony. Again and again, the Soviets have developed a pretty inexpensive investment in a Cuban colonial army which helps them immensely.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I will yield just for a moment.

Mr. WEAVER. I was just wondering if you would oppose our own Government doing the same thing. I mean, do we not have the right to put bases in Turkey? Do we not have the right to send our warships on the high seas? Do we not have the right to use or would you oppose our using troops? Mercenary troops?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad you raised that; I was going to comment on that a little bit later. But I am glad you raised that issue, and I am only going to yield briefly because I want to finish this, then I will yield longer if I have time.

I had a gentleman the other day, when I was talking about Gen. Nestor Lopez who the Cubans have now sent to Nicaragua. General Lopez was sent to Syria to fight on the side of the Syrians against Israel in charge of a Cuban tank regiment. He was sent to Angola in charge of a division to

impose communism in Angola, and a colleague of mine on the left said to me, "But isn't that exactly like our generals?"

My answer was simple: If you do not believe there is slavery and freedom, there is no functional difference between those who use guns to impose slavery and those who use guns to protect freedom. Just as there is no difference between the criminal who uses a gun to rob a store and the policeman who uses a gun to protect a store.

If you are willing to say that a Cuban colonial army imposing a Soviet dictatorship on Angola is morally acceptable, then there is no difference. But in fact my dad was stationed in France and we moved out of France in 1959, and when Charles de Gaulle and the French said to us, "Take all of your troops and leave," we left.

When, on the other hand, the Polish people said in 1956-57, "Russians leave," the Russian Army came in harder. When the Hungarians rose in rebellion, the Russian tanks crushed Hungarian freedom fighters.

When the East Germans in 1953 rose in rebellion, Russian tanks crushed East Germans. When the Czechoslovaks tried to become free in 1968, Russian tanks crushed the Czechoslovaks.

I think that my good friend from Oregon raised exactly the difference between those of us who think there is a transnational strategy for tyranny on the part of the Soviet empire and who see the Cuban colonial army as a colonial army, and those on the left who in fact do not think it is an empire, do not see it as colonialism, and do not seem to understand the difference, the fundamental difference between tyranny and freedom.

Remember, recently when we talked about our bases in the Philippines, no one suggested, "Let us send an American army of occupation to kill Filipinos so we can keep Clark Field and we can keep Subic Bay." What we said was, "If a Philippine Government comes into power and asks us to leave, we will leave." Because, after all, we believe in freedom and in a free people being our allies, not our puppets.

Let the people of Poland tomorrow morning ask the Russians to leave, and they will be met by machineguns. Let the Cuban people tonight ask the Russians to leave, and they will be met by Hind helicopters with gatling guns.

My good friend from Oregon explained precisely the difference between those of us who fear tyranny and those of our friends on the left who do not seem to be able to understand the difference between John Brown who was trying to free the slaves and those who used rifles to keep the slaves in slavery.

Furthermore, it is the Soviets who have encouraged a worldwide network of terrorists who attack Israel, under-

mine the West, and threaten our security as individuals and our very survival as a civilization. Yet we do not even to this day have an adequate doctrinal strategy for transnational terrorism developed by states. Otherwise, how could Qadhafi recently have threatened us when he has a tiny dictatorship and we are the most powerful free country in the world.

It is the Soviets who have developed negotiations as a screen behind which to consolidate dictatorship, train the next cycle of guerrillas and terrorists, and it is the Soviets who have developed gradualism as a strategy. First, Castro took power in Cuba. Then he imposed a Communist dictatorship. Then he developed Communist secret police. Then he accepted a few Soviet trainers. Then a few helicopters. Then a few Mig fighters. Then a couple of submarines. Now he has an army in four different countries occupying colonies for the Soviet Empire.

Inch-by-inch, step-by-step we were told let us negotiate. What happened? The Communists grew stronger in Cuba. Then we were told let us draw the line, and what happened? A year later, 2 years later when we were not paying attention, the Communists crossed the line. What are we seeing in Nicaragua today? It is Cuba all over.

First comes the dictatorship, but let us negotiate. Then come the secret police, but let us negotiate. Then comes training guerrillas, but let us negotiate. Then come the Cuban advisers, but let us negotiate. Then come the Soviet advisers, but let us negotiate.

Then come the Hind helicopters, but let us negotiate. Then come the Czechoslovakian light fighter-bombers, but let us negotiate. Finally come the Mig-23's, but let us negotiate. Then comes the training brigade of Soviet troops, the heavy tanks, then come the missiles.

Not a single thing I have just described failed to happen in Cuba and two-thirds of it has happened in Nicaragua. What is the answer of our friends on the left? It is to not notice it, to explain it away; but frankly what is the effect of our executive branch? It is to fail to develop a diplomatic response, a political response or a military response that is effective.

Finally, it is the Soviets who have developed language into a war of words of great power. Lenin probably most brilliantly personified this when he and his faction lost a fight for control of the International around 1903, and immediately adopted the Russian word "Bolshevik" which means majority.

As Lenin said, "If we who are the minority, they had lost the vote, but they said if we call ourselves 'Bolshevik' meaning majority, and we call our opponents 'Menshevik' meaning minority, then after a year or two, every-

body will believe that we are the majority and they are the minority.

So they were Bolsheviks ever since. It is Lenin who called the Soviet newspaper Pravda, which means truth. Because he said, "I will own truth." He meant by that not merely a pun, but the literal ability of a totalitarian state, as George Orwell told us in "1984," to redefine reality over and over again.

The Soviets believe very deeply in a war of words and in the power of language to shape reality. They understand George Orwell's essay on politics and the English language. They systematically use words which is why they call their armies "peoples' armies" even if they are dictatorships and thugs and terrorists. Which is why they told their Communists in Nicaragua to use "Sandinista" because they knew that if they were called Communists we would have understood it. Yet, we do not even realize that Leninism as a doctrine for the use of language exists.

All too often we use their words. Our Government uses their words. We sent, for example, last year congratulations on the coup de etat on the anniversary of the Soviet takeover of power illegally in the Soviet Union. A nonsensical concept intellectually if there is a Soviet Empire.

Again and again we forget that words in the long run define reality and that if you cannot think it, you cannot say it; and if you cannot say it, conversely you cannot think it. If we think of the Soviets as "Gorbachov is basically a nice guy," and I can find you quotes, the best of them by George McGovern, on Andropov as a reasonable man.

Now, Andropov was the head of the Soviet Secret Police. He helped invent using mental hospitals as a torture ground for people who dissented. He helped develop the Gulag Archipelago. He was the Ambassador who brought in Soviet tanks to crush the Hungarians. There are no adequate words in the West to describe what the horrible thug Andropov was functionally even if he drank scotch and pretended to be nice personally.

Because we lack the words, we all too often deceive ourselves. We are a little bit like the story of the "Three Little Pigs" in which, if the Little Pigs had said, "Oh, that is not a wolf, that is essentially a well-meaning mammal with a strange appetite for protein," they would, over a time, have decided that we would have, if the wolf had described himself in Leninist terms as a "hairy pig," and said, "Yes, I have nutrition problems, but do not think of me a wolf, wolves are those people over there. I am essentially a hairy pig, and yes, I eat protein, but I will not eat you today." You would understand then far better the nature of

Gorbachov, Andropov, Chernenko, and the Soviet Empire.

Vision must lead to words. Our vision cannot exist if we cannot say it. Strategy must lead to policies, to strategies, and they must lead to structures for implementation. Operations must be definable tasks for which we can hold people accountable.

□ 1315

The tactics on a daily basis must be a doctrine that fits our vision of strategy.

It was totally appropriate for this Congress to impose human rights limitations on the Government of El Salvador if we were going to support it. In my judgment, it is totally appropriate for us to impose human rights limitations on the freedom fighters in Nicaragua if we are going to support them. That is making a doctrine of freedom fit at a tactical level our vision of freedom, but I think you then have to be able to supply the trainers to make sure they are well trained. You must be willing to supply the kind of detailed help that is necessary if the forces of freedom are going to win.

That is why, frankly, I think we should declassify a lot more. If we in fact have, as the Central Intelligence Agency keeps claiming and the White House keeps claiming, if we have massive documentary proof of the existence of the Soviet disinformation network, then our vision of freedom should require our Government to declassify those arguments and let us talk it out here in public and let us look at them and let us learn which ones are important and which ones should worry us and which ones are relevant.

Let me within this framework of vision, strategy operations and tactics, go back to the first proposition. Is there a Soviet empire? Does it use a Communist Cuban army to extend its power, and has it developed a transnational strategy for imposing tyranny on people?

I think it is clear, the Soviet empire is real. It has developed a transnational strategy for tyranny. It does use the Communist Cuban colonial army as a colonial army around the world and it is helping terrorists so that they will undermine the free world.

Why if those are true, and I think it is almost impossible for a reasonable person to deny that at least at a fundamental level they are true, why then do so many people reject this reality so totally?

I would suggest that to an American in the late 20th century the central challenge of the reality of the Soviet empire is intellectual and psychological. Intellectually, many Americans simply do not want to believe in the weird and frightening reality of the Soviet empire. They refuse to read Russian history. They refuse to study

Lenin. They refuse to study 40 years experience of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe. They refuse to study 26 years of Castro's communism in Cuba. They refuse to examine the emerging new historiography about the Vietnam war and the success of a Vietnamese colonial imperialism allied with the Soviet empire. They refuse to study the Grenada documents and their clear lessons about the nature of the Soviet empire. They refuse to study the true meaning of Marxism-Leninism as an instrument of tyranny and the deliberate ways in which the Grenadian Communists with Cuban and Soviet training and guidance were lying to the American Government and the American people and were manipulating our sincerity to mask their tyranny.

These Americans who intellectually hide from reality deny the over 16-year pattern of Nicaraguan Communist ties to Cuba and to Middle Eastern terrorism.

They also reject the clearly colonial nature of the Cuban occupation of Angola. They ignore or refuse to confront the gruesome terrible daily reality of a thousand people a day dying in Communist Ethiopia from deliberate actions by the Communist dictatorship designed to strengthen its grip on the country. They ignore or refuse to study the realities of military power and so they never read "Sun Tzu, the Art of War," Clausewitz on war, Mao Tse Tung on "Guerrilla Warfare," or Lenin on "Totalitarian Power."

This first weakness is the intellectual weakness of ignorance, a weakness which was described by James Madison, who said:

Knowledge shall forever govern ignorance and a people who mean to be their own governors must forever arm themselves with the power which only knowledge can give.

But this first weakness of intellectual weakness is compounded by a second weakness, the psychological block on learning, which psychologists call cognitive dissonance, which is driven by an isolationism and a pacifism, the will to avoid knowledge which might be frightening.

Starting with the horrors of World War I, there has been a growing western world tendency toward pacifism and isolationism. Henry Wallace in America in World War II, George McGovern who campaigned for Henry Wallace, Jimmy Carter who in many ways accepted McGovernism, Walter Mondale who defended McGovernism; today there is a generation of politicians, intellectuals, and religious leaders on the left who I think in many ways find it very, very difficult to deal with the weird frightening reality of the Soviet Union and find it easier to be reassured by a fantasy that is pleasant, but simply does not conform to the real world.

The fact is that there is a Soviet empire of tyranny and there is a rational historical basis for its existence.

The key to understanding the Soviet empire is to recognize how different from us it is.

The key lesson of Charles Krauthammer's essay on "Mirror Images" in his new book "Cutting Edges" is that many of us on the left simply refuse to accept that Khomeini is different from us, Gorbachev is different from us, the Kremlin is different from us, the Soviet tyranny is different from us.

The key lesson of Theodore White's book "America in Search of Itself" in which he talks about how hard it was for the Carter administration to recognize that Khomeini was by Western standards a barbarian, that is, a man outside our culture, which is what the word means, is equally difficult for the rest of us in dealing with the Soviet Union.

Western civilization is a set of values, the importance of the individual, that no one is above the law, the right to private property, the right to a free press, the right to free elections, to give power to those in government and to take back that power, the right to freedom of religion and freedom of speech.

Note that in Western civilization these are rights and they limit and control the power of government over the individual citizen, as even Richard Nixon found when we proved once again that no one person is above the law.

A student at the University of Virginia Law School the other night asked me, "Aren't we and the Russians really sharing the same civilization? Don't we and the Russians really have the same heritage?"

The question was based on my discussion of Japan, and he said, "But isn't Russia more like us than Japan?"

My answer in a word is "No."

In fact, there is a form of shallow history and a kind of racism which suggests that because Russians are white and we are white and most Americans are white, that we must be more like the Russians; yet the fact is that Oriental Japanese, Asiatic Indians, Caucasians who happen to be Americans, have far more in common in political and legal values than any of us have with Caucasian Russians.

The fact is that in political values and government systems, India and Japan are more western than the Soviet Union. The fact is that while we have a deep cultural and societal difference with Hindu-Muslim and Buddhist Indians, we share with the people of India a deep reverence for the law, for the rights of the individual, for a free press, for elections.

The fact is that while we have deep differences in culture, history and ge-

ography with Japan, we share a similar process of law and government and society.

It is the Soviet Union which is a strange and barbaric country, a throwback to the Middle East, a medieval czarism with a computerized modern secret police.

The weird frightening uniqueness of the Soviet empire in the late 20th century is captured brilliantly in Paul Johnson's "Modern Times, a History of the 20th Century."

The tragedy of the Russian people and the even greater tragedy of the dozens of other nationalist nationalities, oppressed, colonized and exploited by this weird mutation of a great Russian medieval empire, the Duchy of Muscovy, into a 20th-century empire, shaped by Leninism and held together by terror, is something we have to confront directly.

Solzhenitsyn has explained brilliantly in fiction and nonfiction the grim ruthless savage reality of the Soviet empire. It is there in his books for all who will simply look: "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," the "Gulag Archipelago," the "Cancer Ward," and others.

Can anyone read them without tears, think of them without deep sadness, ponder the nature of that evil empire without fear for freedom and humanity?

An American writer, Harrison Salisbury, caught the essence of Soviet tyranny, the savagery of the police state, the brutality of the system that Gorbachev heads in his novel "The Gates of Hell." It is a novel about two characters who resemble Solzhenitsyn and Andropov. Anyone who reads it will understand why President Reagan called the Soviet Union an evil empire.

The Soviet Union is not only terrible for human freedom and human decency, it is the last great colonial empire.

Ed Lutvak's book, "The Grand Strategy of the Soviet Union," makes clear how obvious the Soviet empire is if you simply ask straightforward questions. What is the Soviet domination of Poland but an empire?

What is the Soviet domination of East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, if not an empire?

Our less sophisticated friends on the left will say, what is the difference between NATO and the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe? The difference is exactly the difference between slavery and freedom.

When De Gaulle left us to leave France, we pulled out.

When the East Germans rose in 1953, they were crushed.

When the Hungarians rose in 1956, they were crushed.

When the Czechs moved toward freedom in 1968, they were crushed.

When the Poles rose in Solidarity in 1980, the Soviet sent a simple message

to Jaruzelski, "Either you crush the effort for freedom or Soviet troops will crush it."

Note the American confusion in the Gerald Ford-Jimmy Carter debate in 1976, because it illustrates the failure of vision and strategy in America. Technically, under the old rules of sovereignty, Poland is sovereign and Gerald Ford tried to say that, but he lost ground politically because Americans understood that it is dumb to think of Poland as a free country. While Poland may be technically sovereign by the most gruesome rules of law, it is clearly a colony of the transnational Soviet empire. So Jimmy Carter, who in fact favored George McGovern's policy, sounded tougher than Gerald Ford because the State Department had coached Ford to say that which was technically correct at a technical level, but at the vision level was clearly dumb and wrong.

Poland is not sovereign in any sense except in the most grotesque. Poland is a colony of the Soviet empire.

Similarly, the Ukraine today as we talk has a vote in the United Nations because it is theoretically free. There is a simple test. The United States, the Reagan administration, should ask the Soviet Union to allow us to open an embassy in Kiev, recognizing the Ukrainians. We should recognize the Ukraine as a separate country, or we should insist that the Soviet Union withdraw its phony puppet colony vote from the United Nations.

But note today how the Soviet empire wins both ways. It uses a transcendental strategy of lies and Western gullibility to get both. They get the vote in the United Nations for their colony and they get to keep the colony.

The weird frightening reality of the Soviet empire and the degree to which it is very different from Western values, the rule of law, free elections, freedom of religion and free press, can best be seen in the context of Russian history, Leninist ideology and the recent activities of the Soviet police state and the Soviet imperial effort through its Cuban colonial army.

Paul Johnson's brief description of czarist Russia and Lenin's adaptations of the 19th-century czarist secret police into a 20th-century totalitarian system is brief, concise and conclusive.

The Grenada papers, the 35,000 pounds of documents captured from the Communist dictatorship when Americans liberated Grenada and the 800 pages of documents published by the State Department proved conclusively that modern Leninist governments are systematically trained in Lenin's methods.

Since Gorbachev's wife is a professor of Marxism-Leninism, it should be obvious just how central Lenin's thoughts on power and tyranny are to the operations of the Soviet empire.

To try to understand the Soviet empire without studying Lenin is like trying to understand the U.S. Government with no knowledge of the American Constitution or American political parties; yet Lenin's writings are so ruthless, so savage, so antihuman, so alien to Western values, that most Americans shrug them off and refuse to take them seriously.

There is a real parallel between the psychological will to avoid reality and hide in the fantasy of pacifism and isolationism in the 1930's and the same determined psychological avoidance of reality on the religious left, the academic left, and the political left over the last 30 years.

No reasonable person can read the published open documents, Lenin's writings, the speeches of Brezhnev, Andropov, and Gorbachev, Castro's speeches, the "Seventy-two Hour Document of the Nicaraguan Communist Dictatorship," and their public statements, the published writings of the Vietnamese Communists since their victory, as cited by Fox Butterfield in his brilliant New York Times article, "The New Vietnam Historiography," the thousands of pages of documents from Grenada.

Given the consistent straightforward pattern of Soviet imperialism and its open published record of telling us what it will do, doing it, and then telling us it has done it, why is it so hard for the leftwing of American life to learn?

Eric Hofer's "The True Believer," John Francois Revel's, "How Democracies Perish," and Walter LeQuier's "The Terrible Secret" give us some of that understanding and perhaps of the three of them, Walter LeQuier's is the most powerful and the most frightening for LeQuier went back and looked at the annihilation of the Jewish people at Auschwitz, at the terrible holocaust of Nazi Germany, and he asked in his book, "How could westerners fail to have believed? How could they fail to have learned? How could they fail to have noticed?"

He cites perhaps most tellingly Felix Frankfurter, the great Justice of the Supreme Court, who when briefed by a European Jew on what was happening, said to the young man, "I cannot believe you."

And the young man started to object and he said, "Please, understand me. I believe the facts you say are true. It is simply impossible for me to believe it is possible for the world to be so horrible. I cannot in my soul, in my heart, believe the world could be so evil."

And yet as our troops walked through those concentration camps, it was clear the world was that evil.

□ 1330

TRIBUTE TO ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER SHIMON PERES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk a little bit this afternoon about the Peres government in Israel.

In the fall of 1984, the nation of Israel seemed deeply troubled. The war in Lebanon had polarized Israeli society internally, and damaged the country's prestige internationally. Severe economic difficulties were evidenced by an inflation rate for the month of September that, if projected on an annual basis, would have been a staggering 1,000 percent. The peace process, once symbolized by the Camp David accords, had deteriorated to the point where even relations with Egypt seemed near breaking, and expanding the peace process seemed far from reaching the goal of the political agenda.

The elections of that summer seemed to hold no promise of better times. They seemed, instead, to underscore the deep divisions and the many factions of Israeli politics, when Shimon Peres took the reins of a shaky coalition government, the obstacles before him looked virtually insurmountable.

Yet, in the year and a half that Prime Minister Peres has held office, he has won the respect of both allies and opponents with his political skill and decisive leadership. He has demonstrated the courage to tackle Israel's foreign and domestic crises head on. Despite the difficulties posed by Israel's contentious factions, he has clearly charted a new direction for his nation.

In doing so, he has restored the confidence of many of us who had wondered if the policies of the past government would mean that Israel had turned forever from the vision of its founders. Shimon Peres has not only revived Israel's ideals, he has tempered those ideals with the heavy dose of pragmatism required to tackle the formidable problems of Israel today.

Among Prime Minister Peres first priorities was to help his nation overcome the trauma of its experience in Lebanon. The Likud party still continues to throw barbs at each other for the excesses of that period. Peres, however, has never sought to cast blame. Instead, he has shown a determination to move the nation forward.

By achieving, albeit slowly and painfully, the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon, he has helped the nation heal the wounds of war. Speaking of the decision to withdraw Israeli troops last spring, Peres himself said:

We have returned to our values as a nation, as a people, as a nation that has principles.

At the same time he has kept a vigilant eye on the security needs of his nation, reminding the Israeli people that the withdrawal was the key to re-establishing "our national consensus on defense policy."

In the economic realm, as well, Prime Minister Peres has shown an evenhandedness and a willingness to face very tough choices. During the 7 years of Likud rule, the inflation rate in Israel had jumped from 40 percent to more than 400 percent per year. The annual rate of growth of the country's economy had slipped from 9 to 10 percent in the early 1970's to between 1.8 and 1.1 percent in the final years of the Likud. Since 1977, the nation's budget deficits averaged 15 percent of its gross national product, that is three times higher than last year's deficit in the United States. The occupation of Lebanon alone cost Israel \$1 million a day.

There will be no quick fixes to these deep-rooted economic problems. Yet Prime Minister Peres has shown the backbone to make the hard decisions Israel needs. He has imposed a strict austerity program, in spite of the protests of some of his closest supporters. He has called forth from a people who have already given so much for the good of their nation, new sacrifices on the economic front. As a result, the inflation rate was reduced to 182.5 percent last year, less than half the rate of the previous year. Budget cuts have been made, and the nation's balance-of-payment deficit has improved.

To those who had feared that Israel had become hopelessly addicted to American aid, Peres has shown not only that Israel intends to protect its economic independence but that it is sensitive to America's economic constraints as well. The decision of the Peres government to voluntarily return \$51.6 million in U.S. economic aid for this fiscal year, is a welcome reminder that the ties of friendship between our nations run both ways.

Finally, on the most intractable issue of all—the frustrating search for peace between Israel and their neighbors, Shimon Peres has shown a willingness to extend the extraordinary leadership required to make progress. When Prime Minister Peres spoke at the U.N. last October, he issued a historic call for a "new phase in the Arab-Israeli peace process."

He set in motion a new dynamic, which has since sputtered but has not yet died. He offered new hope for talks between Israel and Jordan, and for progress on the Palestinian question. In his speech to the assembled delegates, he expressed a new determination to look our younger generation in the eye and vow to do all that is humanly possible so that never again will

a young boy die in a war we failed to prevent.

The road to peace in the Middle East will be a rocky one; it has been a rocky one. We should have no illusions about that. The promise of last fall's diplomatic initiatives has since waned.

For Israel the question of peace is complex; the debate intense. As Thomas Ferguson of the New York Times has recently observed, "The debate involves much more than security arrangements alone. For many Israelis it is also a debate about the borders of land, the borders of heritage, the borders of history and the borders of dreams. That is what gives it its passion."

But it is initiatives such as those by Prime Minister Peres at the U.N.—by the leaders who have the personal courage to take the first step, to seek mutual understanding, and to build a frame work for communication between peoples—that give peace its promise.

Israel will continue to be a nation with special problems, and a special relationship to the United States. Because it is surrounded by hostile neighbors, the question of security will be a priority which overshadows all others. America needs to acknowledge this and to continue to provide what we can to ensure the security of our closest ally in the Middle East.

These extraordinary security concerns, combined with its commitments to social and economic equality, and its mission to open its doors for all Jews seeking a homeland, will continue to keep the Israeli economy in precarious condition. Americans need to realize this, and be ready to provide support to help Israel keep its economic house in order.

Our commitment to Israel as a nation and a people is deep and irrevocable. It is borne not only of our awareness of Israel's strategic importance, but of a profound moral obligation and an abiding sense of kinship.

We will still expect to criticize if certain leaders and policies seem to be misguided.

That is the strength of our democracy, the ability to criticize when warranted. We, in this body and in this Nation, should not be afraid to give just criticism where just criticism is due. We have a tendency here to be less critical than the opposition, frankly, in Israel itself.

Until the Palestinian question is resolved in a way that guarantees the full rights and dignity of all peoples in the Middle East, the people of Israel will neither find security from the threat of war, nor spiritual peace among themselves. Yet, we need to always keep in mind the vigors of Israeli democracy which guarantee that such debates will flow freely in Israel itself.

And we must take time to honor and applaud the leaders of Israel, like Prime Minister Shimon Peres, who remind us of that nation's noble traditions and who have held out new prospects for peace. Above all, we must not let this opportunity pass to renew our own commitment to peace in the Middle East. Now is the time for the United States to once again make peace in the Middle East a national priority.

□ 1340

CASE OF MYSTERY POISONINGS IN OREGON SOLVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago on the 28th of February, 1985, I made a speech during a special order on the floor of the House. As a matter of fact, this is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing that speech on February 28, 1985, a year ago in which I warned my fellow Oregonians and the Nation about a town that was poisoned. Let me read the opening of that speech. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have a strange and terrifying tale to tell the House. It is about a town that was poisoned. This town has a population of 10,000. When the poison struck, over 700 were taken violently ill. There were, in fact, 715 confirmed cases of poisoning. Another 117 had severe symptoms. Over 45 hospitalized. A pregnant woman and her husband were poisoned; her baby born soon after had the effects of the poison. Fortunately, no one died.

The poisoning was investigated thoroughly by county, State and Federal health authorities. The investigation pointed directly to the food from salad bars in eight restaurants in the town. Another two restaurants without salad were implicated, although fewer cases from these two restaurants were reported. The poisoning occurred in two waves in September of 1984, with an astronomical 450 cases reported on the weekend of September 23.

Continuing to quote from my speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1985:

The poison was salmonella typhimurium. The town was The Dalles, OR. To dramatize for you how unusual this outbreak of poisoning was, let me cite some figures:

The Dalles has not had a single case of reported salmonella poisoning since 1978. Before 1978, only one or two cases a year were reported.

The entire State of Oregon has reported salmonella cases ranging from 250 to 400 a year. The Dalles outbreak had 715.

Most significant of all—highly significant—The Dalles outbreak did not come from one food source from one site nor did it occur at one time. The sources of The Dalles outbreak were eight salad bars. And the outbreak came in waves.

Salmonella is not easy to catch, like the common cold or flu. It is difficult to pass from one person to another in ordinary encounters. It almost always occurs from

eating food that has been contaminated, improperly cooked, or left out of the refrigerator too long. Salmonella feeds on protein and usually occurs in meat, poultry, eggs, fish, milk or cheese. Not green lettuce salad.

Mr. Speaker, that speech was the result of an investigation that I personally made on the salmonella outbreak in The Dalles. I had planned when I went to college to get a doctorate in biology. I have continued to read in biology most of my life. When I spotted the unusual occurrence of salmonella in the town on that September of 1984, I felt something was wrong. I had made a daily investigation, speaking with the health authorities of Oregon and of the Federal Government who were investigating it. I pored over their data. I analyzed their computer runs. I came to the conclusion that something very dangerous had occurred.

I went to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and I asked them to conduct an investigation. They felt that there was not enough cause to warrant an investigation.

I went to the health authorities and the health authorities said well, we do not think anything happened at all. We think it is just a common case of salmonella outbreak, perhaps the food handlers in the eight restaurants did it. I said to them at the time, the food handlers in eight restaurant salad bars at one time? That is not the way salmonella works, and you know it. But the health authorities maintained their position and, therefore, no investigation occurred.

I said to myself I know after my investigation that something very wrong is out there. I believe that my constituents, that my fellow citizens of Oregon, of Portland, of Eugene, of Cottage Row, of Ashland as well as the citizens of The Dalles could be in danger.

What would you do if you knew someone was poisoning the food in your town, in your neighborhood, that your children might be sickened, might die? Would you not go and do everything you could to try to stop it? I did. I made this speech trying to alert the authorities and the people of Oregon to the danger that might occur to them.

Here is how I concluded my speech that time of February 28, 1985, a year ago:

Who would do such a terrifying thing? Who would poison a whole town; or at least 715 of its citizens? Whoever did could not have known how many people they would poison, or whether someone might die from the poisoning. But the massive assault on the people of The Dalles was that: a massive assault, almost a war on the town. Who would want to do it? And who would have the capability to do it?

Is there a madman lurking in The Dalles? The poisoning was an insane act, an act of violent hatred, carried on with subtle means. There must be such a person or per-

sons with the motive and ability to assault this town, for it actually happened.

That concluded the part of my speech about the poisoning and my investigation of the poisoning. But I went on in a new section of my speech. I had no concrete evidence leading me to believe who might have done this poisoning, but I wanted to show what was happening within a few miles of the towns where the poisonings took place and I began talking about a group of people who had arrived in Wasco County. The Dalles is the county seat of Wasco County, in 1981. They were followers of a native of India who called himself Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh.

I went on to describe the Rajneesh and I went on to describe in that speech how they had begun recruiting from throughout the United States down-and-outers who lived on skid rows of major cities, and they had transported these people, thousands of them, to Rajneeshpuram, the town they had built in Wasco County, as many of us believed, to influence the election that would occur in a month or so from the time of the bringing in of the State people and the poisoning of the people of The Dalles.

I said in my speech:

The person who spoke for the Rajneeshes most frequently was a woman called Ma Anand Sheela, the personal secretary of the Bhagwan. On September 18 press reports quoted Ma Anand Sheela saying to a rally:

You tell your Governor, your attorney general and all the bigoted pigs outside that if one person on Rancho Rajneesh is harmed I will have 15 of their heads, and I mean it. You have given me no choice. Even though I am a nonviolent person I will do that.

Ma Anand Sheela said that on TV the day the greatest wave of salmonella poisoning occurred in The Dalles. Remember, 715 people came down with virulently ill salmonella typhimurium poisoning. A baby born of parents who had the poisoning itself could have died. One man had to go through several operations to relieve himself of the problems he had incurred in the poisoning.

So I did this speech on the floor of the House. The press in Oregon took me to task for this speech and they said that I did not know what I was talking about, that it was, and I quote one press service report saying I made a "long, rambling speech on the floor to an empty Chamber." Well, the Chamber is empty today. My speech I do not believe is long and rambling. I can tell you the speech I made a year ago on the floor of the House was a carefully reasoned, carefully thought out speech, but the press seemed to feel that if they can criticize me in any way, they would take this instance to do it as well.

Two days ago, a Federal grand jury in Portland, OR, indicted Ma Anand Sheela for salmonella poisoning of The Dalles. They are not convicted, but a Federal grand jury has heard witnesses and has felt compelled to bring forth indictments against Ma Anand Sheela and her associate, Ma Anand Puja, who was connected with the medical laboratory.

I had pointed out in my speech a year previously that you not only had to have the motive to want to poison a whole town, you had the ability to do it. And I said that the Rajneesh had a bright new medical laboratory at the Rajneeshpuram capable of culturing the salmonella, and so it turns out this is the case. Ma Anand Puja was one of the directors of that medical laboratory.

The Associated Press carries the story, Portland OR, AP:

Two former lieutenants of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh have been charged with mastering a 1984 food-poisoning outbreak that sickened more than 750 restaurant customers in The Dalles. Ma Anand Sheela, the Indian guru's former secretary and Ma Anand Puja, the former head of the Rajneesh medical corps, were indicted Wednesday on a Federal charge of conspiring to tamper with consumer products. The women are accused of conspiring to place the bacteria, salmonella typhimurium, in food at several restaurants in the northern Oregon city of The Dalles.

Mr. Speaker, I do my best to represent the people of my congressional district and, of course, Oregon. And when I came to a conclusion that the town of The Dalles had been deliberately poisoned, and spelled this out in a carefully reasoned speech on the floor, first having asked the police and health authorities to do further investigation, and having their unwillingness to do that, I felt compelled to make that speech to alert the people of Oregon to the danger they were in.

□ 1355

I was taken to task by the press for doing so. I now ask the press, in all fairness, to print on the front pages of your newspapers and on your television stations and on your radios, the fact that JIM WEAVER was right, and he had cause to be right.

I did my best to alert the people and authorities of Oregon to the extreme danger we were in. Ourselves and our children, throughout Oregon, from mass poisoning of our food by people who were capable of such an act.

My own intensive investigation of the food poisoning in The Dalles pointed me to no other conclusion but that the Rajneesh did it. It is possible, and I can take comfort in this: That the Rajneesh might have perpetrated other food poisonings, and who knows but maybe they did; there were food poisoning outbreaks in Portland, in Ashland, in Cottage Grove soon

after. I have no idea whether they came from the same source or not.

I can say this, that by throwing the spotlight on the Rajneeshis and the salmonella poisoning in The Dalles by my speech on the floor a year ago, I may have prevented them from perpetrating any further such heinous and insane acts.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I do not take positions on issue as serious as a massive food poisoning in a town of 10,000 people or on the WPPS nuclear plant fiasco or on other issues of great moment unless I have conducted a careful, thorough, extensive investigation; have thought out every single ramification, and then I will make my conclusions known if I feel there is public purpose for it.

I did so a year ago, because I felt that the people of Oregon were in danger, and I wish that the press—although the press did its job; it carried my message. Unfortunately, the health authorities would not budge, but remained adamant in their position that somehow or other, food-handlers in eight restaurants simultaneously had caused this outbreak of the salmonella, when everyone knows salmonella is seldom passed hand to hand, but must be cultured in food.

When the health authorities remained adamant, I could only take my case to the people to try to alert them to the danger we were in. I ask the press now to carry this vindication, and I do not feel all that gratified by this. I was simply doing my job, and I intend to continue to do my job. When I see danger facing my constituents, either economic danger, military danger, or danger from mad people who had poisoned an entire town, I will do my duty.

HELPING MILITARY FAMILIES ON HOUSEHOLD GOODS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw my colleagues' attention to a problem facing our military families. My colleagues know that I am deeply concerned with the quality of life we provide to our military personnel and their dependents. I am pleased that I was able to join in efforts to ease the burdens on our military families in the last session and that many of my original proposals found their way into the Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1986. But this is an ongoing issue and there is much yet to be done.

Today, I would like to talk about the problems associated with limits on the temporary storage of a servicemember's household goods. It is a major financial problem for many of our military families, but it is a problem we can solve with very little effort and even less expenditure.

As all of my colleagues know, our service men and women are subjected to great financial burdens and hardships during a Government-ordered permanent change of station [PCS] move. A servicemember must move from one post to another, often at very high cost, and set up housekeeping at a new post. After finding housing and making first and last month's payments and deposits, it is not uncommon for a military family to find itself several thousands of dollars in debt upon reaching a new post. And the servicemember who finds housing is lucky indeed in certain areas, such as the one I represent.

The Government, in order to help out the servicemember, pays for the storage of a servicemember's household goods for 180 days in order to give the servicemember time to find adequate and affordable housing, either on- or off-post. If the servicemember needs his or her goods to remain in storage after the 180-limit has expired, the servicemember must pay the costs of storage.

In most areas of the country, a servicemember can find housing within the allotted 180 days. This is not the case, however, in my district. On the Monterey Peninsula—the home of Fort Ord, the Naval Postgraduate School, the Defense Language Institute, and Fort Hunter Liggett—on-post housing is scarce and off-post housing is both scarce and expensive. The vacancy rate on the Monterey Peninsula, in fact, is only 1.5 percent. Housing is so expensive that some military families are forced to share housing with other military families. Worse still, some families are forced to separate because housing for a family is simply too expensive.

This situation, which is all too common, forces many of our service men and women to require on-post housing. But there is not yet enough housing to meet the needs of our military families on the Monterey Peninsula. At last count, in fact, there were 2,500 names on waiting lists for on-post housing. And the wait can be long indeed.

At Fort Ord, it is common for a junior enlisted officer to wait 1 full year for on-post housing. But the Government only pays for the storage of his or her household goods for 6 months. This means that the servicemember must pay the storage costs for the additional 6 months, or longer. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why we should shift the burden of storage costs on the servicemember when it is not the servicemember's fault that we have not yet provided enough military housing.

Thankfully, this Congress has authorized funds that will enable Fort Ord to house more of its military personnel and their dependents. It is my hope that we may, in fact, reach a point in the not-too-distant future where the housing shortage at Fort Ord will be a thing of the past. But it will take time for this construction to be completed. And, in the meantime servicemembers at Fort Ord will continue to pay for the storage of their household goods, unless we act.

Current law allows for extensions beyond the 180-limit in only very limited circumstances. I think we need to broaden these allowed circumstances a bit. For this reason, I have been joined by my colleague, PAT SCHROEDER, in introducing legislation that

would allow for extensions beyond the 180-day limit when "the Secretary concerned determines that temporary storage in excess of 180 days is justified by reasons that are beyond the control of the member concerned." One of these uncontrollable circumstances would be an exceptionally long wait for on-post housing.

Passage of this legislation would mean that if, at the end of the allotted 180-day period, the servicemember has not yet been able to find on-post or adequate off-post housing, that the military will continue to pay the costs of storage.

The approval of this legislation would greatly ease the financial burdens on our military servicemen and women, and it would cost very little to enact. According to an Army estimate, the enactment of this legislation would only cost \$800,000 a year over the next 5 fiscal years. It is a very small investment, when you consider the size of our defense budget, but it would mean a great deal to the quality of life available to our military personnel and their dependents.

We are talking essentially about fairness. Our military personnel enter the service to serve their country. They ask only that we provide them with a minimum standard of living. If we cannot yet provide enough housing for our military personnel, then the least we can do is ease their financial burdens while waiting for available on-post housing.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will only clarify existing law. It will cost very little money. And it will make life a lot easier for our military personnel. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

A text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4484

A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide increased authority for the temporary storage of household effects of members of the uniformed services in connection with a change of duty station

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TEMPORARY STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.**—The second sentence of section 406(b)(1)(A) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in accordance with the regulations in effect on January 1, 1986, or when the Secretary concerned determines that temporary storage in excess of 180 days is justified by reasons that are beyond the control of the member concerned."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the storage of baggage and household effects after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SLATTERY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GINGRICH) to revise and

extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, March 25.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WEAVER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WEAVER, for 60 minutes, March 25.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WEAVER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINGRICH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORE.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. DANNEMEYER in two instances.

Mr. CHENEY.

Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. LUKEN.

Mr. HAYES.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 21, 1986:

H.R. 2453. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1985, 1986, and 1987 for commodity distribution, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4399. An act to designate the Federal building located in Jamaica, Queens, NY, as the "Joseph P. Addabbo Federal Building";

H.J. Res. 534. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain pro-

grams relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 25, 1986, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3086. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting proposed changes to the selected acquisition reports [SAR's] and unit cost reports [UCR's]; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3087. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled "Fiscal Year 1985 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions," pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3088. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey property to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

3089. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3090. A letter from the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, Department of Energy, transmitting reasons for not completing a written agreement within 6 months on the development of a nuclear waste repository with the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, pursuant to Public Law 97-425, section 117(c); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 4476. A bill to encourage the continued exploration for and production of domestic energy resources, to remove certain Federal controls over domestic energy production and utilization, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4477. A bill to improve the conventional defense capabilities of the Armed Forces by providing research, development, and testing funds for vitally needed conventional weapons and equipment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DiOGUARDI (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

H.R. 4478. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for additional immigrant visa numbers for natives of certain foreign states which have had a significant decrease in immigration to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself and Mr. DELLUMS):

H.R. 4479. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated as the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.R. 4480. A bill to provide that the Internal Revenue Service may not before July 1, 1987, enforce its regulations relating to substantiation requirements for the deductions attributable to the business use of vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4481. A bill to increase the criminal penalties for the intentional poisoning or adulteration of food and drugs for human consumption; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUKEN:

H.R. 4482. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the registration of certain nonprofit entities which provide health services and sell prescription drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 4483. A bill concerning United States policy toward Nicaragua; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and Appropriations.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 4484. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide increased authority for the temporary storage of household effects of members of the uniformed services in connection with a change of duty station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4485. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to the standards for participation of skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 with respect to the ombudsman program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 4486. A bill to provide for the distribution of Amtrak of 50 percent of the funds received by the United States for any sale of Conrail; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to authorize a youth minimum wage differential under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4488. A bill to restrict smoking to designated areas in all buildings or building sections occupied by the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STRANG, Mr. REID,

Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 4489. A bill to provide for ski areas on national forest lands, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.J. Res. 576. Joint resolution to approve the President's request for assistance for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance with certain modifications and conditions; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

H.J. Res. 577. Joint resolution to designate the weekend of August 1, 1986 through August 3, 1986 as "National Family Reunion Weekend"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOLINARI:

H.J. Res. 578. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning November 17, 1986, as "Working Dog Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. FOGLIETTA):

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Vatican should recognize the State of Israel and should establish diplomatic relations with that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

319. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DANNEMEYER introduced a bill (H.R. 4490) for the relief of Joseph W. Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 128: Mr. VENTO, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 2943: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 3437: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 3521: Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FOWLER, and Mr. STRATTON.

H.R. 3897: Mr. TALLON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HATCHER, and Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 4003: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4014: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HENDON, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4183: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 4267: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 4321: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.J. Res. 87: Mr. LOEFFLER.

H.J. Res. 167: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROE, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HENDON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DiOGUARDI, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. McCAIN.

H.J. Res. 381: Mr. McCAIN, Mr. COATS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. RUDD, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HENDON, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MONSON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STRANG, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DASCHLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WALGREEN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. FRENZEL.

H.J. Res. 500: Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. YATRON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. COURTER, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.J. Res. 536: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 277: Mr. PETRI, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H. Res. 395: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BATES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WEISS, and Mrs. BOXER.

H. Res. 404: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. CARR.